

efficient farmers could not make the economic grade. Thousands of prosperous farm families and small town merchants have seen their sons and daughters leave for the great urban areas of our Nation because the opportunities for economic advancement are there, and the cities are the centers of cultural and recreational amenities.

It is a fact of life that the young people of this age do not want to stay on the farm.

But opportunity in America ought not to be based on an accident of geography. The President's message is an attempt to coordinate many existing resources, from the local to the Federal, and to revitalize our rural communities so that they might also share in the Great Society.

I wholeheartedly support that part of the message which declares a parity of opportunity for rural America. The President states that these gaps remain between the levels of living in rural America and those in urban America—gaps in income, in education, in housing, in health, and sanitation facilities.

What is there left in life? Those are the things that concern us all, and that we most need.

We need an increase in national economic prosperity to increase employment opportunities; full access to education, training, and health services to expand their earning power; and economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America is called for.

To specify one thing particularly in the message, I comment on the challenge which the President has issued, to get improved prices at the marketplace at less cost to the Government. This is one statement we all like, because we are all interested in the question of less cost to the Government. But the challenge is to utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer and to encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers, rather than depend on the Government as a source of supply.

The last time I checked, the cost of storing our surplus commodities was running at more than \$1 million a day.

I hope the private sector of our economy will stop criticizing the farm program, accept the challenge, and see if it can help reduce the excessive cost to all Americans, and thus help ourselves and our Government.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY NEXT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to query the distinguished majority leader as to what he contemplates as the legislative program for the remainder of the week and for the following week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, responding to the question raised by my distinguished friend the minority leader, first, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today,

it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be a morning hour when the Senate convenes on Monday next.

The next order of business will be to consider the 35 items on the calendar at this time, all reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, and all having to do with funds for committees to function for the remainder of the year.

It is my hope that each committee chairman and subcommittee chairman involved will be in the Chamber Monday, because they can then anticipate, and they should be prepared for, the assault, in a sense, on many of these resolutions by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. So I hope they will be present, because the Senator from Louisiana will be here. In their own interest, they had better be ready.

On Tuesday, February 9, and this has been discussed with the distinguished minority leader and with other interested Senators—it is anticipated that the stockpile bill, reported from the Symington subcommittee, and approved unanimously, I believe, today by the Armed Services Committee, will be laid before the Senate and made the pending business and debated.

There will be other bills reported next week from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and other committees. Those bills will be considered as soon as they reach the calendar.

Then, on the 11th, the Lincoln Day recess—not vacation—begins and ends on the 16th.

When anyone refers to these "vacations" it must be remembered that they take into account the Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays involved.

So it is anticipated that the Presidential inability constitutional amendment, reported unanimously by the Subcommittee on the Judiciary under the chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and I understand the full committee, today, will be the pending business on the day the Senate resumes on Wednesday, February 17.

Following that, it is anticipated and hoped that the Senate will be able to take up the gold cover bill, as soon as hearings shall have been concluded. It should be ready for action at that time.

That is all the information I have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 8, 1965.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 4, 1965:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS

The following-named persons to be Interstate Commerce Commissioners for terms of 7 years expiring December 31, 1971:

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia (reappointment).

John W. Bush, of Ohio (reappointment).

U.S. ATTORNEY

Richard L. McVeigh, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years vice Warren C. Colver, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse from Isaiah 26:3: *Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee.*

Let us pray:

O Thou who art the inspiration of every noble ideal and principle, may we daily profess and proclaim our faith in the sovereignty of Thy divine will. Grant that we may not fail to enter the sacred retreat of prayer and there bring our many needs to Thy listening ear and understanding heart.

May a sense of Thy greatness and goodness transcend and supplant those feelings of anxiety and uncertainty which so frequently dissipate our strength and destroy our peace of mind.

Show us how our beloved country may be used by Thee in lifting and leading struggling humanity out of the lowlands of fear into the lofty heights of freedom.

Inspire us to pray more fervently and labor more zealously for peace on earth and good will among men.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, for certain activities of the Department of Agriculture.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon,

and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86-420, appointed Mr. DODD to be a member of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico on February 11-18, 1965, vice Mr. INOUYE, excused.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-417, the Chair appoints as members of the James Madison Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. SMITH, of Virginia; Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia; Mr. MOORE, of West Virginia; Mr. GLENN ANDREWS, of Alabama.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 42, United States Code, section 2251, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

THE LATE HONORABLE CHARLES B. MCCLINTOCK

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of the Honorable Charles B. McClintock, a Member of the House for the 16th District of Ohio in the 71st and 72d Congresses, in Canton, February 1.

Judge McClintock was a most distinguished citizen, honored and respected by all during over 40 years of service to county, State, and Nation as prosecutor, Member of Congress, and jurist. His career was an inspiration to me and his friendship was greatly prized.

I ask leave to extend at this point in the RECORD the obituary of Judge McClintock which appeared on page 1 of the Canton Repository, and I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the passing of our late distinguished colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The news article referred to follows:

C. B. MCCLINTOCK

Death has ended the long public career of Charles B. McClintock, lawyer, coun-

ty prosecutor, Congressman, and appellate judge.

He died at age 80, Monday afternoon, at the McKinley Nursing Home where he had been a patient for some time, moving there from his home at 1023 14th Street NW.

Shortly after the death of his wife, the former Ruth M. Grant of Wilmot, his health began to fail and he resigned his seat on the Fifth District Court of Appeals bench where he had served 16 years.

The name C. B. McClintock, as he became known professionally, received national attention in 1926 and 1927 when he prosecuted five men indicted in the murder conspiracy that brought the assassination of Don R. Mellett, publisher of the Canton Daily News.

He had been elected county prosecutor in 1922 and was reelected in 1924. At the conclusion of that term he was appointed by the county's common pleas judges as a special prosecutor to complete the Mellett murder trials.

In 1928 he was elected to the first of two terms as Congressman from the 16th District, which then included Stark, Tuscarawas, Wayne, and Holmes Counties. His election shifted the district from the Democratic to the Republican column.

He returned to law practice in March 1933 and ran for judge of the 15-county Fifth District Court of Appeals in 1946. To win election over the Democratic nominee, Arthur Limbach, he defeated the veteran Clyde C. Sherlock, of Ashland, in the Republican primary.

Judge McClintock was reelected in 1952 by a record margin of 123,000 votes and again in 1958. On March 1, 1963, with 2 years of his third term remaining, he decided to retire and sent his resignation to Gov. James A. Rhodes.

Judge McClintock was born May 25, 1884, on a farm in Wayne County, a son of the late J. W. and Emma (Huguelet) McClintock. When he was 5 the family moved to Beach City where he attended grade schools and Beach City High School.

After his graduation from high school, the young man taught school for 5 years and attended spring and summer terms at Mount Union and Wooster colleges. One of his pupils was the late Benjamin Fairless, who became president of United States Steel Corp.

He enrolled at Western Reserve University Law School, taught night classes at Central High School in Cleveland while he was studying law and received his law degree in 1910.

He came to Canton and began practice in association with Canton's famed lawyer, Luther Day.

The jurist's first public office was as assistant county prosecutor in charge of civil work for 4 years and he entered the race for prosecutor in 1922, when he was elected to his first term.

It was at a time when prohibition brought a nasty era of bootlegging and other crime to Stark County as well as many other portions of the Nation.

Shortly after he became prosecutor, the ugly specter of bribery charges rocked Canton's city administration. Prosecutor McClintock sent three defendants to the penitentiary on bribery charges and in the spring of 1924, Gov. Vic Donahey removed C. C. Curtis from office as Canton's mayor in one of the few instances of such gubernatorial action in Ohio's history.

As prosecutor, his record was enviable. In 4 years his office disposed of more than 700 criminal cases. His trials brought only four acquittals.

In a statement at the end of 1957, when he announced his candidacy for a third term on the court of appeals bench, Judge McClintock pointed out that more than 96 percent of his opinions which had gone up to the Ohio Supreme Court had been upheld.

Judge McClintock's death takes the last of the Mellett murder prosecution officials from the scene. One of his assistant prosecutors, Henry W. Harter, Jr., who later became a common pleas judge, died more than a dozen years ago. His other assistant, James M. Aungst, passed away last year.

The Mellett trials brought scores of newsmen to Canton from major cities and the press associations.

Several months after the young publisher was shot to death as he put his car in his garage, Prosecutor McClintock had elicited a confession from one man and he accepted a guilty plea to a lesser charge with a short prison term as compensation for having turned State's evidence.

Three of the five indicted were convicted of murder charges and sentenced to Ohio Penitentiary. A fifth defendant was found guilty at a first trial, won a court of appeals reversal and was acquitted at a second trial on a change of venue to Columbiana County.

Judge McClintock was a member of First Methodist Church; Canton Lodge No. 60, F. & A. M., and Ohio State and Stark County Bar Associations.

He is survived by a sister, Mrs. Alexander Stevens of Winter Park, Fla.

Funeral services will be conducted Thursday at 10 a.m. at Schneeberger Funeral Home at 1137 Market Avenue North. Rev. Kenneth Bowser will officiate. Burial will be in Greenlawn Cemetery at Wilmot.

Calling hours at the funeral home will be Wednesday from 7 to 9 p.m.

Judge McClintock's favorite charity was the Stark County Humane Society.

WNEW RADIO PETITIONS CONGRESS TO RELEASE THE USIA FILM "JOHN F. KENNEDY: YEARS OF LIGHTNING, DAY OF DRUMS"

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of the 89th Congress I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 47 to permit American citizens in the United States to see the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums."

I believe that every American should have the opportunity to see this film which has already meant so much to people around the world. This splendid documentary captures the spirit of the Kennedy years and gives a special sense of the potential of the best of our Nation.

I hope that Congress will act soon to make this film available for distribution.

Mr. Speaker, WNEW radio in New York has taken the leadership in advocating that all Americans be given an opportunity to see the film. WNEW did a half hour documentary program in its "Sunday News Closeup" series on December 6, 1964. Entitled "The Film You Cannot See," this excellent program featured interviews by Jerry Graham, director of WNEW News, and Rudy Ruder, assistant director for public affairs, with film critics Bosley Crowther, of the New York Times, and Judith Crist, of the New York Herald Tribune, who had been so moved by the USIA film that they agreed that it should be made avail-

able to the American public. Carl Rowan, the Director of USIA, was also interviewed. Senator JACOB JAVITS and I were also privileged to participate.

At the conclusion of the program WNEW announced it would petition Congress to release the film and invited the listening audience to respond. Immediately after the program was broadcast, WNEW was deluged with telephone congratulations and pledges of support.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD excerpts from a letter describing the reaction which was written to me by Jerry Graham, director, WNEW news, and Rudy Ruderman, assistant director for public affairs:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER

Immediately after the program was broadcast, WNEW was swamped with telephone congratulations, and pledges of support for the petition to Congress we announced that we were preparing. And there was much praise for your announced intention to introduce a sense-of-Congress resolution at the opening of the new session.

The audience response was massive; we are still receiving letters of support for the petition, nearly 1 month after the broadcast. We have tabulated some 900 names thus far. On the air, we asked only that listeners who shared our view that the "Years of Lightning" film be released within the United States, send us their names on a postcard or write their Congressman. But a substantial number also added comments, and this letter to you will include some typical ones. We also are enclosing a transcript of the December 6 program.

The postcards and letters came predominantly, of course, from the primary WNEW listening area: New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. But many also came from other New England States; and we received a request from as far as California for a copy of the tape, from a gentleman who had heard about it from a friend here in the East.

Upon hearing the tape, the gentleman from Los Angeles wrote to us again, saying in part:

"It was one of the best planned programs of its kind. We especially appreciated the superb quality, its narration, music, and editing. It carried its message with dramatic impact."

From a couple in Dover-Foxcroft, Maine: "We certainly want our names added to the petition (to have Congress release for domestic showing) the wonderful film about our beloved President Kennedy and what our country stands for. It is this kind of information that should be rubbed off on American citizens * * * so they may realize and appreciate and stand up for this wonderful United States of America. Your radio presentation of the sound track was most touching and impressive."

From Palisades Park, N.J.:

"Excellent program; please add our names to your petition list to get the John F. Kennedy USIA film shown in the United States."

A lady executive of a West Side Manhattan fashion house wrote on her firm's letterhead:

"Your program is to be commended as a public service * * * we enclose the following list of names and addresses of New Yorkers who sign this petition to their representatives in Congress to make known their sentiment on the subject."

The list contained some 46 names; that letter, and all the others, are on file in our studios, and, of course, can be made available if the Congress so desires.

A gentleman who works for an East Side Manhattan film company wrote that he wanted to add his voice to the "many others

asking you to take whatever action possible to insure that the film be released in the United States. Your efforts for this worthwhile film to be seen by the people of the United States will be most appreciated and most useful for everyone."

A letter from a listener in Westchester County:

"By all means let the citizens who paid for it, see it."

A woman in Hollis, New York, said: "We so very much would like to see the film on our dear, late President Kennedy. He played a vital part in each of our lives. It is unfair to deny us the right to see this great work of art."

From Long Island City, a request from a lady:

"The Congress should make an exception in this particular case, so that everyone can view this fine documentary that they may better understand the basic aims of our Nation."

A second-grade schoolteacher in Brooklyn reminded us:

"Care must be taken (not to set a precedent) that government funds may be used for partisan motives; but care must also be taken that partisan motives do not support rigid resistance to a growing demand from the American people (to see) a film that provides a review of the deepest meanings and implications of an event in history still fresh in our experience * * * this documentary was apparently prepared with taste and artistry. Its availability particularly to schoolchildren is necessary."

A woman from Manhattan's East Side said the film should be shown in movie theaters throughout this country, and added:

"It is unbelievable that it could be considered a propaganda piece for the present administration; we have a right to see it."

A housewife in Bellaire, Long Island, sent us a letter signed by 15 of her friends from other Long Island communities, and from Manhattan, Bronx, and Queens as well. Her letter read in part:

"Wholeheartedly in support of this film being shown in the United States. I do hope WNEW and others can urge Congress to pass a special law allowing the USIA to distribute it to American theaters."

A lady in Forest Hills wrote that she agreed the people of the United States should be given an opportunity to view the film. "This movie should be shown in the United States as well as abroad. Let me congratulate WNEW on taking the initiative in this so very worthwhile effort, along with Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN."

These comments were repeated over and over, and there was not one single nay-sayer among the 900.

After the program, "The Film You Cannot See," was broadcast, a WNEW reporter contacted your colleague from across town, and across the aisle, Representative JOHN LINDSAY. He said, in an interview we broadcast later that evening, that he, too, agrees the USIA film should be shown in this country. The American people, he said, should be able to judge the merits for themselves, of material that is prepared primarily for overseas consumption.

In conclusion, Mr. RYAN, we reaffirm our dedication to the proposition that this film is a "must-see" for all Americans, and we respectfully request that you, as the representative of great numbers of our listening audience, accept and act on this petition.

Cordially,

JERRY GRAHAM,
Director, WNEW News.
/s/ Rudy Ruderman
RUDY RUDERMAN,
Assistant Director for Public Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend WNEW for its initiative in bringing this important question to public attention.

Jerry Graham and Rudy Ruderman have performed a most constructive public service in producing the program "The Film You Cannot See." I urge all my colleagues to act favorably on the petition which WNEW radio has laid before the Congress.

CONDEMNING SOVIET PERSECUTION

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I join with several of my colleagues in the House and Senate in again introducing a resolution condemning Soviet persecution of her citizens of the Jewish faith. It is known that religion is not looked upon favorably by the Soviet Union. It is also known that those of the Jewish religion have a particularly difficult time in practicing their religion. The power of the Soviet state consistently has been used to prevent the free exercise of the Jewish religion; synagogues and seminaries have been closed; religious publications suppressed; the baking and distribution of matzohs during Passover prevented; numerous "economic crimes" have been charged against Jews; and various other state-encouraged deprivations have occurred. I do not have to go into greater detail concerning this religious persecution, as the facts have become well known.

On December 19, 1963, in a speech on the floor of the House I delivered a detailed account of the situation in the Soviet Union. At that time I submitted facts which showed that restrictions on Jewish worship were far greater than on other minority religions.

If the experience of the last 30 years teaches anything, it teaches that we cannot be silent in the face of anti-Semitism. As the Representatives of the people, we have a special obligation to express the conscience of America on this important issue. The resolution I have introduced today states:

That it is the sense of the House that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let us pass it before Passover, which falls on April 16 of this year. On February 3, the Rabbinical Council of America representing 900 rabbis in the United States and Canada appealed to the new Soviet leaders to permit the baking of matzohs. If this resolution is adopted by April 16, it would aid in this appeal and further the cause of religious freedom.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I congratulate the gentleman on his statement and the resolution he has introduced. I introduced earlier this week a similar resolution which I had also introduced in the 88th Congress, but which was not acted upon. I join with the gentleman urging support of these resolutions.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman for his support in this great cause.

EMPLOYEE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, none of the legislative issues confronting the 89th Congress is likely to stir more controversy or generate more heat than the proposal to repeal section 14(b)—that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act which leaves with the several States the authority to outlaw compulsory union shop agreements.

What promises to be a debate of major proportions is already raging in and out of Congress, ignited by President Johnson's reference to 14(b) in his recent state of the Union address. As this debate proceeds toward an historic climax, it is my purpose today to focus attention upon certain fundamental legal and civil rights which are inextricably involved in any thoughtful consideration of legislation to sanction compulsory unionism—legal and civil rights which, in this context, the modern-day "pseudoliberal" seems eager to ignore or brush aside.

It is my firm conviction that repeal of 14(b) must be conditioned upon the enactment of certain fundamental safeguards for the workers who are, or would be, compelled to join and make payments to a union in order to hold their jobs. If such safeguards are included, along with meaningful provision for effective enforcement, I am prepared to support, and to advocate, the repeal of section 14(b).

I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 4350, which would accomplish these purposes. It is entitled the "Employee Civil Rights Act of 1965."

It is a bill which ought to rally the enthusiastic support of true liberals in both parties.

My bill would strike the existing provisions of 14(b), and would extend the privilege of negotiating union shop agreements to labor organizations in all of the 50 States. However, my bill would not take away State power to check union abuses in this area without substituting Federal power to protect the basic legal and civil rights of individual workers who would be affected.

Briefly, under my bill it would be unlawful for a union which makes an agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment—

First, to discriminate on account of race, color or creed;

Second, to use the dues collected for political purposes or for any other purpose not related to the union's statutory function as collective bargaining agent; or

Third, to fine or penalize a member for exercising any legal or civil right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Of course, the enumeration of such basic individual rights would be meaningless without provision for effective enforcement. Under my bill, a union which violates any of these fundamental employee rights could not enforce a contract provision which imposes union membership as a condition of employment. Those who suffer damages as the result of a violation could file a civil suit in Federal district court, or they could file an unfair labor practice charge with the National Labor Relations Board, in order to obtain appropriate relief.

As my bill indicates, I join the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the call for an end to discrimination in union membership and union apprenticeship programs. And I share his recently expressed concern that 14(b) should not be repealed unless "assurances" are provided that unions which enforce compulsory membership requirements will not discriminate.

Of course, I assume that the chairman is also contemplating "assurances" in the nature of accompanying legislative safeguards with effective enforcement provisions. Surely, responsible legislators could accept nothing less.

While impressive strides have been made toward political equality in recent years, this progress has not been altogether comforting for the American who cannot get a job because of his color. To be sure, the "Equal Employment Opportunity" title of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, despite its limitations, can be a useful instrument in the eventual attainment of its stated goal. However, the way provided by title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which requires discrimination charges to be filed first with a State agency, must look like a long and almost hopeless road to Negroes in a number of States.

It is unfortunate, but true, that discrimination by labor unions is often a more serious problem for the Negro than discrimination by employers. This is particularly true so far as apprenticeship and training programs are concerned. Where compulsory union membership is not a requirement, Negroes can often find it easier to obtain a job, or an opportunity for training.

Obviously, if Congress, without providing effective safeguards, should repeal 14(b) and thereby sanction compulsory unionism in the 19 States which have so-called "right-to-work" laws, the Congress, by its action, would actually reduce the economic opportunities for Negroes and increase the difficulties they face.

Surely, a Congress that is truly concerned about poverty and the economic plight of the Negro, will not deliberately extend compulsory unionism into the very States, in some cases, where discrimination problems are the most serious—unless individual workers are ef-

fectively protected against discrimination.

My deep concern for another fundamental civil right is appropriately reflected in the safeguards of this bill. Individual citizens—including those compelled to join a union—are entitled to political freedom. Moreover, they are entitled to meaningful assurance that union dues paid under such circumstances will not be used for purposes foreign to a union's function as collective-bargaining agent.

Those who advocate compulsory unionism and oppose State right-to-work laws frequently advance the "free rider" argument. Within limits, this argument has merit; it goes like this: Under the law, when a union is selected by the majority of employees in a bargaining unit, that union is required by law to represent, not just those employees who voluntarily join the union, but all employees in the unit. Since the union must represent all employees, and since all employees theoretically benefit from the union's services as bargaining agent, it is only fair that all employees should be required to pay dues. Employees who do not pay dues are referred to as "free riders."

This argument has considerable appeal in the case of a union which uses its dues only for those purposes for which it is required by statute to represent all of the employees. However, it is very important to note that section 9(a) of the National Labor Relations Act provides that a labor organization selected by a majority of employees "shall be the exclusive representative of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment."

Obviously, the "free rider" argument rings hollow when it is sounded by spokesmen who vigorously oppose any effective legislation to prevent the use of union dues for political or other purposes not related to a union's statutory function as bargaining agent.

As for me, I agree with Mr. Justice Douglas, of the U.S. Supreme Court, when he stated:

The collection of dues for paying the costs of collective bargaining of which a member is a beneficiary is one thing. If, however, dues are used, or assessments are made, to promote or oppose birth control, to repeal or increase the taxes on cosmetics, to promote or oppose the admission of Red China into the United Nations, and the like, then the group compels an individual to support with his money causes beyond what gave rise to the need for group action.

And Mr. Justice Douglas went on to say:

I think the same must be said when union dues or assessments are used to elect a Governor, a Congressman, a Senator, or a President. It may be said that the election of a Franklin D. Roosevelt rather than a Calvin Coolidge might be the best possible way to serve the cause of collective bargaining. But even such a selective use of union funds for political purposes subordinates the individual's first amendment rights to the views of the majority. I do not see how that can be done, even though the objector retains his rights to campaign, to speak, to vote as he chooses. For when union funds are used

for that purpose, the individual is required to finance political projects against which he may be in rebellion. (*International Machinists v. Street*, 376 U.S. 740.)

It is worthy of note that other forced associations are not altogether uncommon or alien to our American way of life. For example, in many States an attorney is compelled to join and pay dues to a bar association in order to practice his profession.

However, I am confident that few Members of Congress—and surely no liberals—would oppose a proposition to preclude the bar association, where membership is compulsory from, first, discriminating against Negroes or, second, using its dues for purposes not related to its professional function or, third, penalizing members for exercising constitutional or other legal rights.

Finally, the safeguards in my bill reflect a serious concern about the ability of a union member to exercise the constitutional and legal rights available to other American citizens.

Unfortunately, there seems to be a noticeable trend on the part of the NLRB and some courts to downgrade and subordinate the legal and constitutional rights of individuals when they become union members subject to union discipline. It is disturbing when any union member is relegated to the status of a second-class citizen. However, this is an alarming and intolerable situation as it affects those who are compelled to be union members in order to work.

Union members have been penalized by union officials for speaking out on political issues in opposition to union policy.

Union members have been fined for not engaging in concerted activities of a union even though section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act specifically confers upon every employee "the right to refrain from any and all such activities."

According to the strange rationale recently applied by the NLRB, such rights are protected when exercised by an employee—but not when exercised by an employee who is a union member.

Under recent Board decisions, a union member who is fined for violating union policy is not necessarily left with an option to pay the fine or drop out of the union. He can be compelled to pay the fine, even if it means garnishment of his wages or attachment of his property.

Surely, if compulsory unionism is to be sanctioned by the Federal Government throughout the 50 States, the right of dissent without reprisal must be guaranteed. The words of Justice Douglas speak eloquently to this point:

If an association is compelled, the individual should not be forced to surrender any matters of conscience, belief, or expression. He should be allowed to enter the group with his own flag flying, whether it be religious, political, or philosophical; nothing that the group does should deprive him of the privilege of preserving and expressing his agreement, disagreement, or dissent, whether it coincides with the view of the group, or conflicts with it in minor or major ways, and he should not be required to finance the promotion of causes with which he disagrees.

I believe my bill is fair and reasonable. It recognizes merit in the arguments for union security, but it does not sacrifice basic individual rights which are at least of equal importance.

It may be that extreme partisans in the ranks of management and labor will not applaud this bill. However, I am confident that the vast majority of thoughtful Americans in and out of Congress will not abandon or ignore the sound principles which it represents.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION IN ALABAMA

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the potentially explosive situation in Selma and other communities in my home State of Alabama is a cause for growing national concern.

There are many conflicting reports regarding the true state of affairs in these Alabama communities, but of this much we are certain: further exacerbation of existing tensions in these areas might well result in a complete breakdown of law and order and consequent violence and bloodshed.

As an Alabamian, I am, of course, deeply concerned with the welfare of my State and its citizens. As a Member of Congress, I believe some measure of responsibility to avert such a tragedy devolves upon the Congress in this case.

Those who last year supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did so in the belief—as one advocate of that legislation phrased it—that passage of the bill would "elevate the civil rights movement from the streets to the court."

Unfortunately and irresponsibly, leaders of the civil rights movement have otherwise interpreted the meaning of enactment of the civil rights bill. In Selma, in Marion, and in other communities of Alabama, these irresponsible leaders have, in effect, taken their movement from the courts into the streets, defying normal processes of justice, law, and order.

What are the true facts regarding the events now transpiring in Alabama? The people of the United States want to know and are entitled to know. And the people of Alabama not only willingly, but eagerly, await an honest, impartial investigation of these events.

In this regard, on Tuesday I received a telegram from Mr. Roswell Falkenberg, publisher of the *Selma Times-Journal*, a leading citizen of that community. Mr. Falkenberg said:

SELMA, ALA.

HON. ARMISTEAD SELDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

In view of continued provocation of local Negro citizens by professional agitators, despite conscientious efforts of a responsible white community to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this newspaper respectfully requests that you urge the immediate appointment of a joint congressional com-

mission to investigate the actual conditions existing in Selma at this time. We urge that an unbiased, responsible group representing both the House and the Senate be dispatched to this city immediately as factfinders to observe the situation in which the city of Selma is being thwarted in an attempt to observe all existing local, State, and Federal statutes.

We believe that the Congress should determine for themselves the true facts without regard to race traditions or propaganda. You must agree that firsthand, on-the-scene knowledge of tragic conditions in any community is equally as important to the national welfare as any of the various surveys which have been conducted by the Congress on problems unrelated to civil rights. Certainly, massive attempts to provoke disunity in any area within the boundaries of the United States demands as much consideration as that in most instances where commissions have been authorized to make investigations in foreign nations.

We do not ask for help, nor do we request intervention. We simply ask that the true facts concerning the racial difficulties now existing in our city be ascertained by the Congress and that these truths be made known on the floors of both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

ROSSELL FALKENBERG,

Publisher of the *Selma Times-Journal*.

Mr. Falkenberg's proposal is both fair and reasonable. Coming as it does from a leader of the Selma community and one of the most prominent newspaper publishers in the State of Alabama, it bears out the fact that the people of my State will welcome any fair, impartial congressional inquiry aimed at uncovering the truth regarding the recent events in Selma and other communities.

In response to Mr. Falkenberg's suggestion, and in cooperation with my colleague, the Honorable GEORGE W. ANDREWS, I therefore have taken this proposal up with the chairmen of both the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, requesting that a joint congressional group, composed of members of these committees, be appointed to go to Alabama to investigate the situation there and report back to the Congress. Yesterday, at the invitation of the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Congressman GEORGE W. ANDREWS and I appeared before the Senate committee and conveyed to them Mr. Falkenberg's request.

These committees have the authority and the responsibility to conduct such an investigation in the national interest, and I am today introducing a resolution directed toward this end.

Certainly any congressional investigation of the existing situation in Alabama should be conducted in a responsible and balanced manner—one which will serve to calm rather than aggravate community tensions in the area.

This resolution is aimed at a responsible and balanced congressional response to the need for a legislative investigation of the situation in Alabama. It would certainly obviate the need for other Members of Congress, whose investigatory role in this matter could only be described as self-appointed, to travel to Alabama. The role of any congressional investigative body in Alabama should be to uncover the facts and report back to the Congress. Let me caution that no helpful purpose can be served by self-appointed congressional groups

traveling to the scene of action and thereby aggravating existing tensions in an already volatile community situation.

As Mr. Falkenberry has said, the people of Selma and Alabama "do not ask for help, nor do we request intervention. We simply ask that the true facts concerning the racial difficulties now existing in our city be ascertained by the Congress and that these truths be made known on the floors of both the Senate and the House of Representatives."

THE CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION IN ALABAMA

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, an explosive situation exists in my State, which has been on the front page of almost every newspaper of America for a period of the past 3 weeks.

When the civil rights bill was enacted last year, the thought was that finally with the consensus of the Congress the matter of civil rights would be taken off the streets and into the courts, but for 3 weeks in the city of Selma there have been constant demonstrations and street operations going on which have consumed a great amount of the press and have been brought to the attention of all of you.

Several days ago a newspaper editor from Selma telegraphed the President and Members of both the House and the Senate and said that he would like an impartial investigation of what was going on in the city of Selma to report the facts correctly to the people of America.

At the time I had no particular desire that this matter, which was being handled skillfully locally with restraint and in good order and within the law, with a sincere desire to abide by the law, be brought before this body, which, in my opinion, has no jurisdiction over the things which have been going on in Selma.

This morning I noticed in the newspaper that a congressional delegation was planning on visiting the city of Selma to investigate matters down there and presumably report to this body or to the press or to whomever they intended to report. I immediately made moves to go into my State myself.

This is an unofficial body of Congressmen consisting of Mr. DON EDWARDS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. POWELL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. VIVIAN, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. RYAN.

I was called an hour ago and was invited to participate in this visit in order that it be an unbiased group. I would like to warn against this unofficial visit into my State at a time when our people and the situation in my State is at such a tremendously high emotional pitch. I fear that an unofficial visit will be regarded by the people of my State as just another collection of professional agitators. They have evidence that there

are already too many of these in Selma now.

I would recommend that if the Congress thinks it is necessary to have an official body visit my State and bring back the facts as to what has been going on down there during the past 3 or 4 weeks, then such a body should be constituted officially and be properly appointed. I urge that my colleagues abandon this attempt of going into my State without the proper authority and, yet, carrying with them congressional status, which would tend to cloak with authority their findings which I do not believe will be reported without bias.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I rise to speak in connection with the same problem that my colleagues, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS] have so ably brought to your attention. I concur in their remarks and heartily support their position.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious times in our country. We southerners are asking that the leaders of this Nation come to the forefront and join with us in seeking rule by law and justice. I urge those who fought so hard to get the civil rights law enacted, now allow this law to operate. It is not being given a chance to operate in Selma because the city is being subjected to mob rule and law enforcement officials are being pilloried by a subversion of the facts and news stories colored to create a false account.

It is true that many of us opposed the passage of the civil rights bill. The bill is now the law of the land and we recognize that fact. The people of Selma and the people of Marion, Ala., are conscientiously endeavoring to abide by the law. I grant that there are difficulties. In Selma you have a people nurtured in traditions as old as the city itself; people who have resisted change and find the new law a bitter pill to swallow. But with determination, in the tradition of good American citizens, they are determined to try to do what is right. They are conscientiously endeavoring to abide by the law.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are those in Selma who have no respect for the law. Martin Luther King has told his followers repeatedly that they need not obey laws with which they disagree. He has called upon them to show their contempt for the law and for those legally charged with enforcement of the law. I do not believe that there can be one set of laws in America for all the people and another code of laws for Martin Luther King.

I ask all who are in high positions of leadership, including the President, to come forth on this occasion and to lend their voices to an appeal to reason. I ask that we in Congress, and the President, support the people of Alabama in seeing to it that law and order prevail. If there are any who have influence with Martin Luther King, ask him to leave Alabama and bring with him all of his agitators who are stirring up racial tensions and hatreds.

Let us act now before greater tragedy occurs or before the spirit of the people of Selma and other small towns in Alabama lies crushed and bleeding beneath the iron heel of mob violence. Let the law work its course. Or are those who spoke so highly of the civil rights bill afraid to give it opportunity?

This is a call, Mr. Speaker, to all good Americans to rise to the challenge we face, take up the burden of the task before us to bring peace to our country so that justice and law will prevail. There is no other way to guarantee justice for all the people under the Constitution and it is imperative that each of us and those in high places take immediate action or bear the responsibility for the death of freedom for the people of Selma. If we take their freedom, freedom may be lost to all of us, including the people Martin Luther King professes to want to help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the motion of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], and also to comment on the remarks of the gentlemen from Alabama, Congressman GLENN ANDREWS and Congressman MARTIN.

Mr. Speaker, the people in my State are law-abiding citizens. We believe in this country and in its institutions and in its laws. It is our purpose to live in harmony and peace with one another. It is very difficult for the people of a city, say, like Huntsville, Ala., to comply with the 1964 Civil Rights Act even though the city of Huntsville has only 15 percent population of Negro people. But compliance is a much more difficult thing when you demand of the people of Selma, with its high percentage of Negro citizens, that they virtually turn upside down the entire power structure of their community and make radical changes in many of their institutions.

I have come to know the people of this city through years of experience, and I know them to be fine Americans and fine people. It is a city that has responsible leadership. There are those in the positions of responsibility at this hour who are manfully striving to keep the peace and to maintain law and order.

Their efforts are being thwarted and frustrated by the actions of those who

have come in from outside the city to organize demonstrations and to attempt to create a situation in which large numbers of people are demonstrating in violation of local law, and a situation of great danger is being created.

We have had experience with this before, in my own city, when the people of Birmingham voted for a change in their city government, when they voted in a mayor and a city council, a part of the platform of which was to work toward the solution of certain racial problems. Because the election was held before their term of office had expired, the existing city commission challenged the leadership of this new mayor and council, and there was a legal court battle going on to determine who were in fact the rightful leaders of this city. It was at this point that Dr. King chose to come into our city to make demands of the city leadership—to make demands which no one could legally answer—and to organize demonstrations which went on for many days thereafter.

Gentlemen, I do not believe this is the kind of action we need to solve our problems, nor will it contribute to the solution of those problems to have a self-appointed investigating committee of Members of this House, not working under the Judiciary Committee or in any other way authorized to conduct a congressional investigation, to go to Selma at this time.

I urge and implore my colleagues to refrain from injecting themselves into a situation which is critical, which could be dangerous, and in which they can serve no constructive purpose. Let instead an official investigation be made, by a proper committee of the Congress, as requested by the people of Selma, themselves.

May I reaffirm my faith in the people of Selma, Ala., of both races, and my conviction that they will, in time, work out their own problems. They will work out their problems in peace and harmony and in line with the law of our land. They will do so, if their efforts are not continually thwarted by those from outside who cannot do other than complicate the situation.

SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. GLENN ANDREWS, Mr. MARTIN of Alabama, Mr. BUCHANAN, and myself immediately follow in the RECORD remarks previously made by Mr. SELDEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that my first remarks on this floor should be directed toward

the problem of civil disobedience in my home State.

I have come to this body, as have my four colleagues from Alabama, mindful that we would probably be characterized as "those five new Republicans from Alabama who were elected only because they are racists and who have come up here with only one thought in mind, and that is to harass our colleagues and impose upon them our feelings on the so-called civil rights issue."

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth.

We are concerned with the disregard for civil authority now being exercised in Selma. Alabama is our home. The very lives of our friends and neighbors stand in danger at this very moment. However, let me affirm first, here and now, that I am not a southern Republican, I am a Republican from the South. I am not interested only in Alabama or only in the race issue; because that is only one facet of the challenge which nourished our interest in becoming Members of this distinguished body.

I feel, however, that a grave injustice has been done here and a grave wrong has been perpetrated upon the people of my State and the people of my neighboring district, in Selma and Marion.

There are facts which should be brought out. Facts which the people of this country should be aware.

First, though it is not known generally, it is true that 2 weeks ago letters were printed in the State of Alabama and the address on the letters was plainly marked "county jail." They were very obviously printed by Dr. Martin Luther King to be mailed out from the county jail in Selma. They were dated 2 days ago, the very day he insisted on being arrested. He has refused bond. He took this action as an essential part of his newest drama, "Peaceful Luther Comes to Selma." This was necessary because his letters now being mailed in my State, printed 2 weeks ago, were already prepared to go out and he had to be in jail to have them valid and to have the dramatic appeal befitting his great hunger for publicity and sympathy.

Secondly, although it is not generally known, it is true that the FBI has asked Dr. King to remove himself from the premises, to remove himself from this inflammatory and volatile situation. They have asked him to please get out and to let law and order prevail. This he has refused to do.

It is not generally known, but the same Nazi that affronted this House the day we were sworn in and who came bursting through these doors, which we all witnessed, was later seen on the streets of Selma. He is not from Alabama, but he is a member of one of many groups of full-time paid agitators, either volunteer or professional. There are many professional leftwing radicals and full-time card-carrying Communists in our State right now trying to initiate and aggravate dissension among the good people of Selma.

Mr. Speaker, any rump session, or ad hoc committee, or self-appointed committee from this body which seeks to go to Selma and lend the dignity of the Con-

gress of the United States to any such biased or partisan groups is no different from this Nazi who chose to intervene in the affairs of the people of Selma. The only purpose and the only conceivable result that can come from this adventure is to foment more trouble and more strife so that they can get more publicity when, in effect, they do not want law and order and do not want the law to take its own course. They simply seek to create discord rather than harmony between the American people. This body should go on record as condemning any such trip—now or in the future.

No self-appointed, self-serving group from this august body has any more moral or legal right in injecting themselves in this situation than the eight Congressmen from Alabama would have in going to Harlem to investigate the moral degeneration in the gentleman from New York's district.

Nor do I recall any such great concern of this group in going to Rochester or Brooklyn in New York State where violence and disorder destroyed lives and public and private damage was estimated to be many, many millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak against something that might present a precedent which after reflection all my colleagues could well regret.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

LET LEGISLATORS KNOW

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Mellus newspapers on January 27, 1965, merits the attention of this Congress. The publisher, William S. Mellus, has effectively explained to the readers of his chain of newspapers, circulated in the downriver suburbs of Detroit, the tremendous impact that citizens may wield by letting their Congressmen and State legislators know of their opinions.

To encourage his readers to send their viewpoints to their legislators, Mr. Mellus has published the names and addresses of the U.S. Senators from Michigan, and of the Congressmen, State senators, and State representatives whose districts are in his newspapers' circulation area.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Mellus newspapers are performing a valued public service worthy of emulation by newspapers throughout the Nation. In view of its brevity, I have asked unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

LET LEGISLATORS KNOW

In order that our democracy may operate in a manner to fulfill the lofty principle so eloquently stated by Abraham Lincoln in his oft-quoted "of the people, by the people and for the people," it is necessary that those in

charge of our Government know what the people want.

The best way for the leaders to find out is for the citizens to tell them. Since personal contact with Senators and Representatives on the State and National level is impossible for all but a very few, the most effective way to get this information to the legislators who represent us is by writing letters.

An individual may ask himself, "What is the use of my writing? I'm just one person and who will pay attention to me?"

It is true that the beliefs and wants of one person may seem insignificant, and his influence may appear to be scarcely noticeable in a nation of nearly 200 million citizens. However, these individual ideas and desires are the fibers that make up the woof and warp of our national consciousness.

Like the tiny threads that are intertwined and woven to produce a rope of great strength, the thought of millions of individual citizens combine to establish patterns of thinking which determine the direction and extent of our national progress.

Unexpressed, the ideas have no effective meaning or strength. Made known in sufficient volume, they become forces which no political leader can long ignore. Our Nation was founded upon the fundamental truth that "In union there is strength." This is as true and as vital now as it was in our earliest days.

On many occasions, the Mellus newspapers have expressed views editorially upon matters of public interest. We often have urged that our readers write to Michigan's State senators and representatives in Lansing and their counterparts in Washington, expressing support of or opposition to important measures. We have made it a practice to list the names and addresses of the legislators or other public officials to whom letters should be directed.

The recent redistricting of Michigan's legislative and congressional districts resulted in changes of long-familiar boundaries. As an aftermath, many citizens are uncertain as to the districts in which they now reside, and as to the names of their State and National legislators.

To overcome this confusion and to enable our readers to readily communicate with their Senators and Representatives both in Lansing and in the National Capital, the Mellus newspapers today inaugurate a special service.

We might describe it humorously as "an aid to people who want to get something off their chests." At any rate, in a special feature elsewhere on this page will be found a complete list of the State senatorial and representative districts and the congressional districts in the communities within our circulation area.

Also listed are the names of each State senator, State representative, U.S. Senator, and Congressman who represents any part or all of this area. This feature will be kept in type and will be published in our newspapers from time to time as space permits. We urge our readers to clip the directory and file it for handy reference.

We also recommend that they write frequently to their legislative representatives, expressing their views on subjects of interest and importance.

And we further request that our readers mail us copies of their letters for our "Letters to the Editor" columns so that we may let others share their ideas.

Let us all do our best to make this truly a government of and by the people, as well as for the people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, the single, overriding issue in foreign affairs, has been the worldwide struggle against communism. The United States has poured over \$100 billion into its foreign aid programs in this fight. We have fought a major war, the Korean conflict, which we failed to win. We settled for a truce. We are now engaged in another war, in faraway southeast Asia, which we are losing badly.

This desperate struggle has forced the United States to maintain a costly defense establishment, on which we spend some \$50 billion a year.

The high cost of foreign aid and maintaining large numbers of troops abroad, has resulted in a steady outflow of gold. Our gold stocks are now so dangerously low that the administration is about to ask the Congress to pass legislation to withdraw the support of gold from our own currency, in order to meet our international obligations.

Despite these tremendous efforts on our part, we are not winning the struggle against communism. In Asia, communism has made tremendous advances, and may well be on the brink of engulfing this whole region.

In Africa, there is daily evidence of growing Communist influence among the new nations there. Communist agitators are appearing all over the continent, and well planned, amply financed Communist activity is ever expanding.

In Latin America, Communist Cuba has become the strongest military power in the hemisphere, outside of the United States, and from this unhappy island a steady flow of Communist terrorists spew out to the rest of the Latin nations, whose mission it is to try to convert and subvert the rest of Latin America to the godless, freedomless society that is communism.

It is plainly evident that if this Nation is to win this struggle against communism, that we must change our tactics and learn and practice new techniques.

I am today introducing a bill, which I firmly believe, is a long step in the right direction of a new approach in meeting communism on far more favorable terms and give us hope of eventually winning against it.

This is the Freedom Academy bill. I hasten to point out that this idea is not mine, but was conceived by Mr. Alan Grant, of Orlando, Fla., some years ago, who has spent a very considerable portion of his life and his energies and his money in seeking a meaningful solution to this struggle with communism.

The Freedom Academy idea is so simple, and to me so plainly sound, that it is hard to see why the Congress does not adopt it forthwith.

This bill would establish a school for the special training of people who would fight this Nation's battles against communism in the cold war spheres.

We have three splendid service academies to train our young men to lead our

Armed Forces. We spend large sums to send them to graduate schools for further training.

Since the struggle with communism is largely a cold war, and not a shooting war, why do we not train our people for this kind of conflict also? Our cold war soldiers need to know and understand the Communist philosophy of government and its dedication to world conquest. Especially must they know the methods by which the Communists seek to conquer. They need to know the language and customs of scores of foreign nations where the cold war is being fought, so that Americans can go to these foreign nations and convince their citizens of the friendship of America, and the danger of communism. They need training in as many variety of ways to meet and successfully defeat communism as the mind of freemen can conceive.

We have been like amateurs against professionals in this conflict. The Communists train their people intensively in special schools for work abroad. We do not give our people similar training. Obviously, we are at a disadvantage.

This Nation has all the resources it needs to successfully stem the tide against communism. There are young people in abundance who would welcome the opportunity to meet this challenge. We can put together a superb faculty, equipped with the necessary tools for teaching. All we need to do is to pass the necessary legislation, this Freedom Academy bill, to get this vital project underway.

Now I do not contend that communism will fold its tent and quietly steal away with the founding of a Freedom Academy. I do say that we will have at our disposal another sorely needed weapon to use in this struggle, a means of training highly skilled people who will be far more adequately prepared to lead our Nation and freemen everywhere in this life and death worldwide struggle with Russian and Chinese communism.

Let us delay no longer. Let us pass this legislation.

THE DEATH OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the passing of a man who stands without question as the outstanding world figure of this century.

Sir Winston Churchill played such a vital role in the history of his nation and of the world that his impact will be felt and his name remembered so long as man inhabits this earth.

Sir Winston was a man of such widely varied talents that no one word can be used to describe him. He was a statesman, soldier, writer, orator, lecturer, painter, historian, and humanitarian. He was the very symbol of the British Empire at its best—tough, cocky, stubborn, confident, humorous, and capable.

To us who were privileged to share the stage of world events with Sir Winston, his memory will remain as an enduring monument to the principles in which he believed and for which he fought. Before any other world leader, he recognized and warned of the evils and dangers of Nazi Germany. Two decades ago he foresaw the coming struggle against world communism.

Throughout his long life he was an implacable foe of tyranny in any form, and fought with determination to protect and expand the advances that mankind had made toward freedom and dignity.

The English nation owes him a debt of gratitude that cannot be measured. In the darkest days of World War II, when it seemed that no power on earth could stop the Nazi juggernaut, Sir Winston stood with inflexible courage and confidence. With his incomparable mastery of the English language, he bolstered the sagging hearts of the English people, and gave them new confidence that their empire would continue. When he stated, simply and calmly, "We shall never surrender," Englishmen and free people everywhere took heart. They suddenly knew, somehow, that this man was right; that Britain would not surrender and that the cause of freedom would prevail.

The United States, and the world, share this debt of gratitude to Sir Winston. Without his valiant leadership and courage, who knows what course the war might have taken? Who can tell what course history would have followed had not the inspired English rallied behind Churchill to halt the tide of Nazi victory in time for the United States to join in the battle?

It is indeed fitting, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Winston Churchill was made an honorary citizen of our country. For we can now share with the British Commonwealth the feeling that we have lost one of our own.

During the grim and bleak days when the Royal Air Force singlehandedly stood off Germany's attempt to bomb England into submission, Winston Churchill uttered a phrase which has become a byword of the English language:

Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow this statement today, and rephrase it to remind the people of the United States that never in the course of human history have so many owed so much to one man.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Abernethy	Adair	Anderson, III.	Ashbrook	Beets	Bingham	Bolling	Brademas	Brooks	Brown, Calif.	Burleson	Burton, Calif.
-----------	-------	----------------	----------	-------	---------	---------	----------	--------	---------------	----------	----------------

Cabell	Cederberg	Celler	Clark	Cohelan	Conte	Corman	Craley	Davis, Ga.	Diggs	Edwards, Ala.	Edwards, Calif.	Evans, Colo.	Farnsley	Farnum	Fascell	Fraser	Gray	Grover	Gubser	Harsha	Herlong	Hollifield	Holland	Hutchinson	Jacobs	Jarman	Jones, Ala.	King, Calif.	Landrum	Lindsay	Long, La.	Long, Md.	Love	McCarthy	McCulloch	Macdonald	Miller	Moorhead	Mosher	Murphy, N.Y.	O'Neal, Ga.	Passman	Powell	Pucinski	Reinecke	Rhodes, Ariz.	Rivers, Alaska	Ronan	Roosevelt	Scheuer	Shipley	Sikes	Skubitz	Staggers	Sullivan	Toll	Tunney	Tupper	Tuten	Utt	Waggonner	Watkins	Williams	Wilson, Bob	Wylder	Yates
--------	-----------	--------	-------	---------	-------	--------	--------	------------	-------	---------------	-----------------	--------------	----------	--------	---------	--------	------	--------	--------	--------	---------	------------	---------	------------	--------	--------	-------------	--------------	---------	---------	-----------	-----------	------	----------	-----------	-----------	--------	----------	--------	--------------	-------------	---------	--------	----------	----------	---------------	----------------	-------	-----------	---------	---------	-------	---------	----------	----------	------	--------	--------	-------	-----	-----------	---------	----------	-------------	--------	-------

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FARM POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 73)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms.

Because 7 percent of our work force can produce our food and fiber, the vast majority of Americans can work at other tasks that make our democracy strong and prosperous.

Because our people eat better at less cost than any other people in all the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things which make life rewarding.

Because we have the means to conquer hunger, we can wage an unconditional war on poverty—and win it.

The farm people of this Nation have made and are continuing to make a lasting contribution to our national prosperity. As a matter of simple justice they should share equitably in this prosperity. They deserve a place of dignity and opportunity.

Farmers want new and expanding markets for their efficient production. Farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system.

As a nation we are increasingly recognizing that food and agricultural policies affect our entire economy. Sound agricultural policy must give full consideration not only to the role of the producer, but also of the processor, the distributor, the exporter, and the ultimate consumer. This is one major reason for a national investment in agricultural programs.

Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world.

WHAT WE WANT TO DO

These are the objectives which should guide us:

1. An abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States.

2. Effective use of our agricultural resources to promote the interest of the United States and world peace through trade and aid.

3. A workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to the Government.

4. Opportunity for the efficient family farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations.

5. Parity of opportunity for all rural people, including new opportunity for small farmers.

The gains which we have made in the past 4 years—in raising farm income, in reducing surplus stocks, in promoting new economic opportunity in rural areas—point the direction we should continue to follow.

THE RURAL SCENE

Rural America is the scene of one of the greatest productive triumphs in the history of man. Yet, despite its service to the Nation, rural America is also the scene of wasted human talent, where there are too many people without jobs and too many with only part-time jobs.

Opportunity in rural America will require wise farm programs to support and stabilize the incomes of commercial family farmers. It will require solutions to the problems of small farmers and those who live in the towns and villages of rural America.

Only one of four rural families now lives on a farm. Only 1 out of 10 boys now growing up on farms can expect to earn a good living as a full-time farmer. Most young people in rural areas must go elsewhere to find their opportunities.

I am determined that the farmers who have been efficient and successful in agriculture shall be fairly rewarded for their success. And I am equally determined that the rural community which has sustained the growth of agriculture shall have the chance to broaden its economic base and the range of opportunity which it can offer the children of its families.

To the White House in recent months have come hundreds and thousands of letters from men and women who live in rural America. Their words are eloquent testimony to the changes which are occurring there and to the uncertainty which those changes are causing.

Thirty years ago, over 7 million American families lived on the farm. Today, 3½ million families feed a population that has grown by 50 percent. Enough food is left over to fight hunger among free people all around the globe.

Thirty years ago, a good farm in the Midwest operated with a capital investment of \$18,000. Today, nearly \$100,000 is needed. In the Southeast, capital requirements rose from \$4,500 to \$30,000.

Farmers with inadequate resources make up one segment of rural America's great unsolved problem of underemployment. Another is made up of families who have left the farm but have not yet found a place in the nonagricultural

sector of the economy. A third consists of families displaced by the decline in the rural-based extractive industries—mining and lumbering.

The rural unemployed and underemployed are largely out of sight. Most of them are hidden in the remote valleys of Appalachia and the Ozarks, on the unpaved side roads of the South, in the once-rich timberlands of the North, on Indian reservations, and in the worn-out mining communities of the West.

The results of opportunity's decline in rural America are reflected in harsh facts:

Lack of a decent life is almost twice as prevalent in rural America as it is in urban America. Only 30 percent of our families live in rural areas, but they include 46 percent of those American families with incomes under \$3,000.

Rural America has almost three times the proportion of substandard houses found in urban areas. A fourth of all farm homes and a fifth of rural nonfarm homes are without running water. Over 14,000 rural communities of more than 100 population lack central water supplies.

Rural people lag almost 2 years behind urban residents in educational attainment. They often suffer from a lower quality of education. Per pupil expenditures for elementary and secondary education in rural school districts are substantially below expenditures in urban districts.

Rural communities lag in health facilities. Rural children receive one-third less medical attention than urban children. Their mortality rate is far higher.

These deficiencies feed on one another. They leave too few resources to support education, health, and other public services essential to development of the talent, skills, and earning power of the people.

PARITY OF OPPORTUNITY FOR RURAL AMERICA

These facts require a national policy for rural America with parity of opportunity as its goal.

There has been a steady migration from our countryside. In the 1950's more than half of America's rural counties suffered a population loss. But farmers who are handicapped by poor health, age, or lack of skill in any occupation outside of farming and who leave their home communities for want of opportunity often create new problems—for themselves, for the communities they leave, and for the cities which receive them.

When people move away from rural areas, the area suffers. Migration leaves vacant stores, abandoned churches, empty schoolrooms, declining tax bases, and a declining ability to support a minimum level of public service.

This is what we need to have parity of opportunity for rural Americans:

National economic prosperity to increase their employment opportunities;

Full access to education, training, and health services to expand their earning power; and

Economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America.

When the rural citizen, his community, business, and government cooperates, the chances for a better rural life increase. Local leadership and initiative are necessary if rural development is to keep pace with the needs of the people. But Government can and should provide information as well as the technical and financial assistance which will speed progress.

Many measures enacted by the Congress in recent years are assisting rural communities in building new opportunities for their citizens. Others I have recommended this year aim at these same objectives.

The Area Redevelopment Act has helped scores of small- and medium-sized communities through loans to new industrial enterprises and loans and grants for needed public facilities. I will soon make recommendations that will urge this act be improved and made permanent.

Under the Economic Opportunity Act, communities will be carrying out programs to provide new opportunity for low-income rural families.

The Department of Agriculture has a wide range of programs to assist in rural economic development—loans for telephone systems, for recreation enterprises, for development of forest resources, for community water systems, and for rural housing. The small watershed and resources conservation and development programs add to business activity in rural areas.

The development of new job opportunities in rural areas has been considerably aided in the past by a strong program of rural electrification. The ability of rural areas to attract and support industrial activities—one of the fundamental solutions to the basic problem of our farm population—rests in very large part upon the availability of electric power. We must and will continue our efforts to enable those areas that do not presently possess an adequate power supply to meet their growing demands and insure that the benefits of industrial diversification are available in rural areas.

Many other activities of the Government are assisting businessmen and farmers to revive dying economies and raise the level of public services in rural areas. These include aid for community facilities, employment services, health and education programs, small business loans, job training, and development of outdoor recreation.

Yet gaps remain between the levels of living in rural America and those of urban America; in income, in education, in housing, in health, and sanitation facilities. Parity of opportunity remains a distant hope for many. It is a challenge we must meet head on.

REACHING OUT TO RURAL AREAS

In my earlier messages to the Congress, particularly those on education and health, I have proposed measures to assist those areas of our country and those families most in need, both urban and rural.

It is not easy to equitably distribute Federal assistance to a scattered rural population. Rural communities often

lack the specialized organizations found in major cities which keep informed of development programs and initiate action to make use of them. Special measures must be taken both by the States, and by Federal agencies to reach rural people, particularly in remote areas.

Since it is clear that an administrative office for each Federal agency or program cannot and should not be established in every county, a method must be developed to extend the reach of those Federal agencies and programs which should, but do not now, effectively serve rural areas.

Accordingly, I have asked:

1. Each department and agency administering a program which can benefit rural people to assure that its benefits are distributed equitably between urban and rural areas.

2. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget to review carefully with the head of each department or agency involved, the administrative obstacles which may stand in the way of such equitable distribution. They should propose administrative or legislative steps which can be taken to assure that equity is attained to assure full participation by rural areas.

3. The Secretary of Agriculture to put the facilities of his field offices at the disposal of all Federal agencies to assist them in making their programs effective in rural areas. The Secretary is creating within the Department of Agriculture a Rural Community Development Service, which will have no operating programs of its own but will devote its energies to assisting other agencies in extending their services. I have requested funds in the 1966 budget to finance this service and to strengthen the capacity of the Cooperative Federal-State Extension Service to assist rural communities in forming strong and active development organizations. In the meantime, I recommend that the Congress—

1. Enact legislation to equalize the availability of home mortgage credit in rural areas. This can be done by supplementing the mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration with a rural mortgage insurance program to be administered by the Department of Agriculture. The Department has administered a direct housing loan program since 1949. But an insurance program will enable the Government to assist effectively a far greater volume of home building with a minimum of budget costs. The Federal Housing Administration has initiated action to extend the effectiveness of its insurance programs in areas where private lenders do not now fully utilize its services.

2. Increase the annual limit upon the Department of Agriculture's existing loan insurance program, which insures not only farm ownership loans but loans for community water systems and recreation development.

We have the opportunity now to provide the means by which people in rural towns and on inadequate farms can join the march toward a better life. We must seize this opportunity.

PARITY OF INCOME FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The commodity programs which were initiated 30 years ago in the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt have helped to create a commercially successful agriculture. I propose that these commodity programs be continued and improved.

Over the past 4 years our commodity programs have raised and sustained net farm income at an annual level nearly \$1 billion above 1960. Few activities so dramatically indicate the value to farmers of good programs well administered. Yet the consumer is the major beneficiary of farm progress. While retail food prices have risen in recent years, the prices of what the farmer sells have actually declined 15 percent since 1947-49.

Our agricultural abundance has also made possible the food stamp, school lunch, surplus food distribution, and special milk programs. These projects are essential to our needy people and to our schoolchildren.

The skill of our family farmers is not an accident. It is the product of a century of public policy aimed at improvement of our agriculture.

Research and education, credit and conservation, and price stabilization have all served us well. They have benefited all Americans, though they were designed as programs for farmers.

Progress is never free of problems. Agricultural progress has made price and income support programs increasingly necessary and increasingly difficult.

The basic need for farm programs arises from the farmer's economic isolation and his enormous capacity to produce. We have today at least 50 million acres more cropland than is required to produce all of the food and fiber that we can consume plus all we can export. Without programs to guide production, new crop surpluses would be inevitable. Even relatively small surplus can depress prices below cost of production levels.

Independent studies by university economists are unanimous in their basic conclusion: the removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect upon farm income.

For three decades we have had programs which, by one means or another, have sought to achieve a balance between supply and demand. Born in the emergency of the 1930's, they have countered the income-depressing potential of the revolution in agricultural production.

Our farm programs must always be adapted to the requirements of the future. Today they should be focused more precisely on the opportunity for parity of income for America's family farmers and lower Government costs. But we must recognize that farm programs will be necessary as long as advance in agricultural technology continues to outpace the growth of population at home and markets abroad.

We need to change much of our thinking on farm policy. Just as we do in other segments of our economy, we need to separate the social problems of rural America from the economic problems of commercial agriculture. We need to be

concerned about both, but the answers to each may be different.

Our programs should—

Provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income;

Assist those small farmers who have little chance to enlarge their operations but whose age, physical handicap, or lack of education prevent their shifting to other employment;

Assist those farm families who seek to enlarge their productive resources in order to obtain a decent living and have the opportunity and capacity to do so.

We must also continue to tie domestic farm policies to our international trade objectives by pricing our products for export at competitive world levels and by relating our production to the longer term demands of world markets.

Our objective must be for the farmer to get improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government.

To do this, I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture to so utilize the Commodity Credit Corporation as to make the free market system work more effectively for the farmer. We must encourage the private segment of our economy to carry its own inventories, bought from farmers, rather than depending on the Government as a source of supply. We must urge the private sector to perform as many services as possible now performed by Government agencies.

PRICE SUPPORT AND PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

I recommend to the Congress that the programs now in effect for our major commodities be continued and improved.

These programs can continue to serve our objectives of increased freedom of operation, a steady improvement of incomes, a greater reliance on market forces, and lower Government costs.

Building on present programs, I recommend the following legislation:

WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN

Voluntary feed grain and wheat programs should be extended. Specific recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress which will permit the operation of these programs to be simplified and make it possible for additional crops—particularly soybeans—to be grown as needed on acreage diverted from grains.

Authority should be continued for the Secretary of Agriculture to set price-support levels and to adjust other program features as conditions may require.

COTTON

The cotton program of 1964 should also be extended and improved. It is essential that cotton be competitive with other fibers and in world markets. At the same time we must adopt measures to reduce the cost of this program and the level of stocks. Specific amendments to current legislation will be suggested to accomplish these objectives.

TOBACCO

The tobacco program must also be reappraised this year. Yield increases, higher Government costs, deterioration in quality, and loss of foreign markets have weakened what has been a highly successful program.

Legislation is needed to authorize production and marketing limits on an acreage-poundage basis. Consideration should also be given to revisions in our programs which will make American tobacco more competitive in world markets.

RICE

Consideration should be given to amending the price-support program for rice to support market prices at competitive world levels, and to provide additional supports for producer incomes from the proceeds of marketing certificates.

WOOL

The Wool Act which expires early next year is operating successfully to help stabilize wool production and bolster producer income. I recommend that it be extended with minor amendments which will be transmitted to the Congress.

LIVESTOCK

The sale of meat animals amounts to nearly one-third of all farm income. The stability of this vital phase of our farm economy is based on the continued stability in our feed supply.

We will continue to cooperate with livestock farmers and ranchers so as to maintain a fair price in the marketplace. We will help them to build markets here and abroad, and to preserve fair competition in the marketing of livestock and livestock products, and continue our present measures which will prevent an undue increase in imports.

OTHER COMMODITIES

Continuing study is being given to programs and needs for other agricultural commodities and appropriate changes and recommendations will be made as circumstances may require.

TRANSFER OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

I recommend that acreage allotments and bases under the several production adjustment programs be made transferable by lease or sale to family farmers in the same State.

This will permit some small farmers to expand their acreage. Others who no longer wish to farm can add to their incomes by leasing or selling their allotments.

LONG-RANGE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The annual acreage diversion and acreage allotment programs now in effect should be supplemented by a long-term cropland adjustment program.

I recommend to the Congress a program which will reduce the cost of our production adjustment efforts, assist landowners in turning their land to non-agricultural uses such as recreation and to forestry, and assist small farmers who want to do other work while remaining in their communities. The proportion of land which could be covered by this program in any area should be limited to protect our communities.

Agriculture's excess production capacity is a longrun problem. A long-term land use program can achieve a large part of the needed adjustment more effectively and with greater benefits than annual diversion programs.

This program will reduce the annual cost of other programs by more than its own cost. It will provide enduring benefits not realized under present programs.

The purposes of the cropland adjustment program will be served if much of the land is permanently removed from production. Every reason exists, therefore, for applying a contribution from this program to the cost of public purchases of cropland for recreation, for enhancement of natural beauty, for prevention of air and water pollution, or for open space purposes.

I recommend that the authorizing legislation permit funds appropriated for cropland adjustment to be used to augment moneys raised by States and local governments and those which are provided by the Federal Government through the land and water conservation fund and other programs for public land acquisition.

RESERVE STOCKS

It is time to consider our requirements for agricultural commodities in a reserve for national security, for emergency relief purposes, and for domestic economic stabilization.

The President should be authorized to determine the levels of commodity stocks required and to take actions to insulate these stocks from the market so that they might be preserved for time of emergencies.

The costs incurred in maintaining that part of our commodity stocks designated as reserves should be separated from the cost of farm price and income support programs. The Commodity Credit Corporation would continue to manage the stocks in conjunction with price support operations.

AGRICULTURE TRADE

The welfare of American agriculture is closely linked to foreign trade. Our 1968 goal of \$6 billion farm product exports was reached in 1964. American farmers last year accounted for one-fourth of U.S. merchandise exports.

These exports have strengthened farm prices, brought additional business income, reduced our surpluses and storage costs, and have helped our international balance of payments. Abroad, they have contributed to political stability and economic progress.

We are not content with the gains we have made in world markets. We expect to make additional gains by improving the means by which we can be competitive in price, in quality, in service to our customers. We will merchandise our products actively, but with full regard to rules of commercial conduct between friendly nations.

In the trade negotiations underway in Geneva, we shall make every effort to achieve liberalization in agricultural as well as industrial products.

WORLD PROGRESS AND PEACE

The food-for peace program is good international policy and it is sound economic policy. Food is a powerful weapon for peace. People who are hungry are weak allies of freedom. Men with empty stomachs do not reason together.

We broadened the food-for peace program last year and are continuing to

study ways to broaden it further. Food shipments under this program help to expand it by building food habits which increase the demand for U.S. products. As the economies of recipient countries are strengthened through American aid, we are able to shift from outright grants of food to concessional sales for foreign currencies and later to sales for dollars.

Foreign currencies accruing from the sales of commodities under the food-for peace program have also provided funds for a worldwide market development program, which has played a significant role in bringing about the dramatic increases in commercial farm exports.

This same program has also strengthened growing economies, contributed to rising standards of living, promoted international stability, and literally saved lives in many less developed countries. Our agricultural resources are thus making a significant contribution to the prospects for peace in the world.

These contributions must continue. They will be increasingly directed toward assisting agricultural development in less developed, densely populated countries, thus fostering overall economic growth, higher living standards and better nutrition. The disturbing downward trends in food output per person in both Asia and Latin America in recent years must be reversed. And these trends can be arrested and reversed only by a massive mobilization of resources in both the food-deficit countries and the advanced countries of the industrial West.

As I pointed out in my message on foreign aid, we must use both our agricultural abundance and our technical skills in agriculture to assist the developing nations to stand on their own feet. Under our assistance programs we will make full use of the agricultural know-how in the Department of Agriculture and in the land-grant colleges and State universities. We will enlist the support and cooperation of private agencies and enterprises of all kinds.

To make this food aid most effective, we plan to gear our food-for peace programs more specifically to the needs of recipient countries and their economic development programs. We may need more flexibility to assure proper nutritional balance in these programs, particularly as they relate to child feeding.

I am asking the Secretary of Agriculture and others concerned to study and recommend changes in agricultural policy that may be needed to accomplish these goals.

COMMISSION ON U.S. FOOD AND FIBER POLICY

All Americans have shared in the fruits of an efficient agriculture. All Americans share also the problems we face in the farm economy and in rural America in the years ahead.

Accordingly, to assist in adapting our farm programs to the needs of tomorrow, and in making rural America a full partner in our national economic progress, I intend to conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agriculture policy of the United States. I will reorganize the National Agricultural Advisory Commission—which has made an invaluable contribution in years past—into a new Commission on Food and

Fiber. It will be broadly representative of rural communities, consumers, producers, industry, Government, and the public. I expect it to make a detailed study of our food and fiber policies and to bring additional viewpoints to bear on the place of rural America.

There are other parts of our agriculture which merit the support of Congress and the attention of all Americans. Conservation of agricultural land is making a contribution to the beauty and the development of our Nation. It can help even more as we attack pollution of our streams and the defacement of our landscape. Research and education must continue to speed our progress in agriculture, to insure the protection of consumers, and to make full opportunity more than a distant hope.

We must win the battle for a better diet. At the same time we must increase the demand for farm products. If the income of all low-income families were brought up to the \$3,000 annual level, per capita consumption of all food would rise by 2 percent. Meat consumption among these low-income families would rise by 15 to 20 percent; poultry by 10 to 15 percent; milk products by about 7 percent and fresh fruits and vegetables by 15 to 20 percent.

The Congress has repeatedly enacted legislation to encourage farmers to improve their economic position through cooperatives. This encouragement and assistance will be carried out, in terms of both the letter and the spirit of the law.

The task of achieving a life of quality and dignity in rural as well as in urban America is one that will engage our minds and hearts and our energies for a lifetime.

We begin with the conviction that this is a goal which is right. We go forward with the knowledge that the unparalleled harvest of today's rural America has been achieved because our ancestors said this, too, was a reasonable goal.

The path we follow may be long. But I am as certain of eventual success as was President Abraham Lincoln when he founded the Department of Agriculture a century ago and thus started us on the path to abundance.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 4, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT'S AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a great message from the President of the United States, setting five goals and objectives of this administration, with which I concur. I doubt if there is any area of disagreement as to the objectives, though as is usually the case, there might be some difference of opinion as to the procedure which should be followed in attaining these goals.

Frankly, I was apprehensive as to the recommendations that the President might make in his farm message, especially in view of statements made recently by the Director of the Budget. In the light of my interpretation of what the President has said and the assurance he has given, indicating his desire to extend to the rural population the "parity of opportunity" enjoyed by other segments of our society, I am encouraged to believe that the recommendations for legislation which will come from the Secretary of Agriculture, will reflect this recognition of the "farm problem" and the President's desire to secure for the farmer "an improved income out of the marketplace, with less cost to the Government."

Representing that area which grows all of the cotton that is produced in the State of Missouri, I am naturally interested in the future of this crop, along with the other commodities produced in the 10th District of Missouri. I am pleased that the President recognizes the importance of cotton and has recommended that along with other basic crops, "the cotton program of 1964 should also be extended and improved," and I could not agree more with his conclusion that, "it is essential that cotton be competitive with other fibers and in world markets." It has been disappointing to all of us that surpluses have increased during this past season, due in no small measure to our inability to meet the goals which had been set in export sales, and it is my hope that the specific amendments to current legislation which will be suggested, will include a more aggressive and a more effective policy to insure increased export sales. Specifically, it would appear that this could be possible through the adoption of a policy, implemented by legislation, to include "fiber" in any "food for peace" program, making it a "food and fiber for peace" program. Further, by insisting on the substitution of both food and fiber, for dollars, insofar as practicable and possible, and certainly to use every precautionary measure to insure that none of the dollars contributed or advanced in any aid program, be used by any recipient country in the purchase of agricultural commodities, which the United States has in abundance, from any other nation.

As this Representative has pointed out on many occasions in the past, in some of our various assistance programs, where this Nation has contributed hard-earned taxpayers' dollars, these same dollars have been used in the purchase of agricultural commodities from other nations, particularly wheat, when the United States had such commodities in great abundance. These commodities could have been given in lieu of dollars.

This Representative views with some alarm and apprehension the recommendation that acreage allotments be made transferable by lease or sale to family farmers in the same State, since this would permit the transfer or sale of allotments from low yield or marginal operation areas to areas of heavy yields, thereby increasing surpluses. By limiting such transfer or sales within the

same county, would still permit small farmers to expand their acreage. It might be well also to consider outright sale of acreage allotments to the Government, thereby compensating the small, marginal operator over a period of years, but permitting the allotment so acquired to be held in a special reserve. This would serve to reduce production, at the same time benefiting the small farmer during a period of readjustment. There is the same basic reason for prohibiting the transfer of acreage allotments from outside the county, or production area, that there is for prohibiting the transfer of acreage allotments across State lines.

President Johnson is to be applauded for pointing out in this message and emphasizing the oft-overlooked fact that all Americans have benefited from the wide variety of programs, directly chargeable to the agricultural appropriation, while the consumer has been the major beneficiary of farm progress. It has been estimated, and I believe correctly, that not less than two-thirds of the agriculture budget is spent on programs which benefit persons other than those directly engaged in the production of our food and fiber. I am referring, of course, to the food stamp program, school lunch, surplus food distribution, meat and poultry inspection, food for peace and other foreign aid programs, subsidized sales to the Armed Forces at home and abroad, and so forth. While some 30 years ago, many were disturbed by the prediction that our expanding population would in the foreseeable future tax the agriculture production of the United States and that by the end of the century this Nation would be unable to produce the food necessary to feed its own people, we now find ourselves in the position so dramatically described by our President when he said, "We have today at least 50 million acres more cropland than is required to produce all of the food and fiber that we can consume plus all we can export."

No one can charge the American farmer with inefficiency. He has been the victim of his own resourcefulness, his initiative, his hard work, and his capacity to implement the advanced technology through which production records continue to be shattered year after year. Again, as the President stated, "The skill of our family farmers is not an accident. It is the product of a century of public policy aimed at improvement of our agriculture." The American farmer has earned the esteem and respect of his fellow countrymen, and we cannot forsake him at this crucial period in our history.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, numerous Americans have expressed concern in recent weeks and months about what was rumored to be the President's agricultural policy. Today the President has spoken and, as those of us who know the President's deep concern for rural Amer-

ica expected, there was no reason to fear his views or his program.

Repeatedly during the campaign of last year, our great President told us of his concern for rural America. He promised that one of the main goals of his administration would be to work for elimination of rural poverty and the adoption of farm programs which would enable the farmer to receive his fair share of our Nation's economic abundance.

Now, in his message to the Congress today, our President has set forth the policy to carry out his goals. It deserves, and will receive, careful study by the Congress. But a first appraisal of the President's statements and recommendations is most encouraging to me.

In speaking of commodity programs, which have helped to create the world's finest agricultural system, the President said, "I propose that these programs be continued and improved." This statement is repeated again later in his message. For those who have expressed fear in recent days, these words should be a source of encouragement.

The President has proposed the extension of the wheat program. I applaud him for this because the wheat program has brought increased income to our wheat farmers. It has reduced further our surpluses of wheat and it has held prices stable for our consumers. It has been popular in the wheat-growing areas of the country. I know because I have heard from the people in these areas and they want to see these programs continued.

The President has not set forth all details of the program in its continuation and he has thereby given us in the Congress a chance to work with the administration in trying to strengthen this program and to improve it as we continue it for future years.

I commend the President for his outstanding message and I know that agriculture, rural America, and the Nation as a whole will benefit from his proposals and recommendations.

The policy set forth in this message indeed justifies the faith and confidence in President Johnson which rural America expressed last November 3. With the President's support, we can now proceed to tackle the complex and significant legislative problems which face us in the field of agriculture.

Equally as important, however, is the President's expressed concern for the future well-being of all rural Americans. His message today outlines the needs of these citizens. While they represent an ever-decreasing minority in this country, our citizens in rural areas are vital to both our economic and cultural well-being.

I am sure that my colleagues who represent primarily urban areas will study this message closely, and that they will approach with an open mind the needs of rural America, just as those Representatives from rural areas have always been sympathetic to the needs of their neighbors in the cities, and will continue to be.

I come from a district which is essentially rural. I find in this message so

much that will be of benefit to my constituents but when my constituents benefit, all citizens in the country benefit because the strength of rural America is vital to the strength of all our people and food is one of our basic necessities.

This is a time for all Americans to pull together for the needs of all other Americans. Our President's programs have this as their primary goal. His compassion and desire to serve humanity should be the guide for each of us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that the National Agricultural Advisory Commission has made an invaluable contribution over past years, and he has called for broadening the duties of this Commission under a broader membership and a more significant name—Commission on U.S. Food and Fiber Policy. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the outstanding men who have served on the National Agricultural Advisory Commission for their wonderful performance during the years since the National Agricultural Advisory Commission was formed. This Commission was organized under a Republican administration and continued under Democratic administrations. From the start, it has been a bipartisan Commission. Its principal criteria for membership was outstanding ability and close association with farm problems of this country. Because of its bipartisan nature and because of the outstanding men who have served on the Commission, it continued to give invaluable advice for more than 10 years.

This Commission has done more than give oral advice. It has written penetrating reports on some of our toughest agricultural problems. The recommendations of these reports have gone far in helping us to develop sound agricultural programs. However, we now need advice not only on farm programs but upon the various aspects of our society which are linked to farm programs—some in a direct manner and some in a not so direct manner. The President is most perceptive in recommending a broadening of the membership and responsibilities of this Commission.

I am sure that the spirit which has prevailed in this Commission during its entire history will continue and it will continue to consist of men of outstanding ability who are chosen because of their intimate knowledge of the problems we are likely to face.

I commend the President for continuing and expanding this valuable advisory group.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's recognition of the val-

uable work of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission and his request for an expansion of its responsibilities are indeed welcomed. All of us are acquainted with the outstanding work of this group of men as shown in their reports, some of which are: "The Family Farm in American Agriculture," "Food and Fiber Reserves for National Security," and "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead." Despite this valuable work, the President recognizes that even broader problems face those who will be concerned with agriculture in the future. These include the problems of nonfarm rural communities, the problems of industry dependent upon agriculture—some as consumers of farm products and some as producers of farm equipment and supplies—the problems of ultimate consumers who are fed by our marvelously efficient agricultural plant; and, of course, the interests of the public, which includes all of us.

With a broadened charter, the Commission on Food and Fiber Policy will become even more of a blue-ribbon Commission than the National Agricultural Advisory Commission was in the past. I hope that many of the members of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission who have done such outstanding work in the past will continue to serve on the new Commission and I hope that those who will be appointed will complement the abilities of those who are reappointed. The advice of this new Commission should go far toward helping us on our knotty farm problems and toward helping us solve the problems of the nonfarm segment of our rural communities. The importance of this Commission cannot be overestimated.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the President's message on agriculture and I believe that he has indicated that once again his interest in agriculture, his knowledge of agriculture, and his understanding of the problems that those who live in rural America today are faced with.

I was particularly interested to read and study his proposals for the various commodity programs.

First, I was pleased to see his recommendation that we continue the commodity programs which are currently in existence. Although I realize that these programs are not perfect, nor do they do all that each of us desire, they have proved valuable to agriculture during the last 4 years. The net income of the farmers is up, our surpluses, generally, are down, and our consumers have a stable supply of food at the lowest cost to them in history.

I was happy to see the President's recommendation to continue the cotton program which we passed last year. The cotton industry of this country, from grower to processor, was in a difficult state previous to the passage of the program last year.

Now the grower can plan on a reasonable and stable income; those in the cotton trade can make their plans based on a program that can be understood; and those who process cotton in the mills can offer competition to foreign producers.

Cotton was on its back last year. Cotton is now rising to its knees under this program to take its place again as an important and stable industry in this country. The President's recommendation to extend and improve the program is an important contribution to strengthening the cotton industry. I congratulate him on this proposal in the agricultural message.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested authority to accumulate reserve stocks of agricultural commodities. These reserves should not be considered as reserves exclusively for national defense. They are reserves to meet civilian emergencies, such as flood, fire, or more massive disasters like the Alaskan earthquake and they are reserves to prevent inflation in the event of weather disasters or other natural disasters.

Our wonderfully efficient agricultural plant has provided us with stocks of many commodities which can be used to start this wonderful reserve. Furthermore, this start can be accomplished without the outlay of any money to acquire such insurance. We have the stocks of wheat; we have the stocks of feed grains; and we have the stocks of cotton which would be needed to meet any conceivable reserve needs. We have some stocks of other commodities, but in the nature of farming, larger accumulations of many of these commodities will occur sooner or later. When this happens, we can fill our remaining reserve needs.

We only have to look at the famine-ridden countries of the world to realize the value of the reserves produced by our Nation's farmers. All of us have read in the paper about food riots in India. Adequate stocks of grain would have prevented such a disaster. All of us recall the horror of the Alaskan earthquake last year. We have no worries about starvation here even with such a monstrous disaster because of our agricultural production. The recommendation of the President is welcomed as a deliberate policy to insure ourselves against disasters caused by a shortage of farm products.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the President's farm message shows great understanding of the many complex problems of rural America. Rural America, as the President pointed out, is home to 30 percent of our Nation's population. The first sentence of the message is challenging enough to stir the interest of everyone. It reads:

The bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

For 30 percent of our citizens, it is this knowledge that causes them to be concerned with the level of farm income. The full text of the message graphically portrays to that portion of our society that does not live on our farms and in our small towns that their lives are greatly affected by the conditions and capacities of rural America. I am sure a greater appreciation will result of the scope and magnitude of the problems we must deal with.

The President expressed clearly his desire to lead in presenting programs for congressional action. It is now the duty of the Congress to aid in seeking the specific actions necessary to improve farm income and enhance life in rural America. The message ended the concern of recent weeks that those who have no real understanding of agriculture's problems would find expression. Though there are many areas that need expanding and some that need to be included by congressional action, I am especially pleased that the President has recommended reserves of farm commodities for national security and emergency relief purposes. The accumulation of such reserves would insure against the effects of disaster. They are not reserves to be used in normal times.

I recall clearly the great shortage of grains which developed at the end of World War II. The United States was the world's breadbasket, and without our large stocks of grains, many people of the world would have died of starvation. Our large stocks have caused many problems, but in times of disaster they are a wonderful asset.

More recently, I recall a plea from India to the United States for additional grain to feed her teeming millions. Because our production of food grains was so efficient and because we had large stocks of such grains, we were able to step in and bridge the gap between India's needs and her grain output.

Domestic disaster also calls for the use of reserve stocks. Many of us can remember the floods of the mighty Mississippi or the Alaskan earthquake. Who knows where food and fiber reserves will be needed next?

We should not put ourselves in the position of being short of agricultural commodities to meet emergency needs. I commend the President for his courage in requesting authority to hold reserves in order to fight disaster.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREIGG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message reaffirms his faith in rural America. In so doing, he has reaffirmed his faith in the future of all America.

Of utmost importance is the President's recommendation that the voluntary feed-grains program must be continued. In addition to this program, a careful evaluation of all programs affecting our agricultural economy is in evidence in the message. As we recognize the complexities of our agricultural economy, I applaud the President's intention, to conduct a fundamental examination of the entire agricultural policy of the United States.

The future of our free society depends, to a large degree, on the stewardship of the soil. As I analyze this measure, it is far more than just a farm message—it is a national message.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message to the Congress on agriculture embodies the greatest and the most promising breakthrough for rural America in modern times.

The President's message is very encouraging for the entire feed-grains economy. His message not only embodies recommendations for the improvement of the feed-grains program, but for improvement of the related cattle and sheep industries as well. This message is directly designed to encourage and strengthen the family farm. I consider the inclusion of the national defense food reserve program a vital addition to our existing agricultural policies.

This message assures that the full weight of the leadership of President Johnson will be exercised in the behalf of those of us in the Congress who are seeking sound agricultural legislation. All in the Middle West owe President Johnson and Vice President HUMPHREY a debt of gratitude for their efforts in insuring that the needs of the feed-grains economy will be met.

The President's message puts to rest the widely circulated notion that this administration would be a party to a program that would drive more agricultural producers from the land. I particularly applaud the President's recommendation that the feed-grains program be continued and strengthened, his request for creation of a national food reserve, and his emphasis on export trade and the food-for-peace program. The recommendation of a Commission on Food and Fiber is not only fitting recognition of the great service that agriculture has provided all Americans, but is a recognition of the fact that our whole national econ-

omy is dependent upon a strong agricultural sector. Finally, it is most encouraging that the President's message included the recommendation of a concerted effort to combat water pollution to preserve for future generations our abundant and beautiful natural resources.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of one of the most farm oriented districts in the United States, I feel impelled to comment on the farm message of President Johnson.

This is in my judgment the best farm program advanced in several years. I was particularly pleased to see the concern for the small farmer expressed by the administration. Contrary to many rumors that were abroad about the plan of the administration to turn its back on the problems of agriculture, I feel the administration has placed before the American people the role of agriculture in its true perspective when it recognized that, "Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms."

The request of the President for a strengthened parity program heartens all of us who have been working for an increased share of the national income for the farmer.

This program has, in my judgment, put to rest the charge that the administration wants to eliminate all but 1 million farmers. From what has been presented here, it is quite evident there is no desire nor plan to force persons off the farm by economic attrition. Rather there is a deep concern that those who have served as stewards of the soil for so long, be given a helping hand when necessity requires it.

I am particularly pleased with the proposals concerning the voluntary feed grain program and the provisions made on beef imports. I feel confident it is a program that the new Democratic Congressmen from the Midwest can support.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I am very pleased with President Johnson's message on agriculture and rural development, which was delivered to the Congress Thursday. It offers a realistic approach to drafting agricultural legislation that will serve the interests of all America, both urban and rural.

The President's message clearly demonstrates that he understands the difficult problems confronting rural America. It demonstrates that he is firmly committed

to the task of solving them. I sincerely hope the President receives the support of all the Congress in that task.

I want to specifically emphasize two important points the President made in his message:

First, that poverty is a rural, as well as an urban problem.

The rural unemployed and underemployed are largely out of sight—

The President said. But they are there, nevertheless, and I hope the Congress will enact the sort of legislation proposed by the President that will make the war on poverty a truly effective force in rural America.

Second, that the farm commodity programs are valuable and should be—in the President's words—"continued and improved." Some critics have suggested that these programs are too expensive. But the only valid test of any Government program is not whether it costs money but whether it accomplishes the purposes for which it is intended.

Last September, for example, the Library of Congress reported that for each \$100 of net Commodity Credit Corporation expenditure on price support and acreage diversion programs in 1961, 1962, and 1963, farm income was increased \$236. And if there had been no price supports during those 3 years, the report added, it would have resulted in an annual loss in farm income of some \$6 billion, as well as annual losses of several billion dollars in farm real estate values.

As a Representative from Iowa, a State where both the rural and urban economy is heavily dependent on corn production, I was particularly happy to read this portion of the President's message:

Voluntary feed grain and wheat programs should be extended. Specific recommendations will be transmitted to the Congress which will permit the operation of these programs to be simplified and make it possible for additional crops—particularly soybeans—to be grown as needed on acreage diverted from grains.

Authority should be continued for the Secretary of Agriculture to set price support levels and to adjust other program features as conditions may require.

The feed grains program has been a success. It is essential for Iowa, and for the other States that have benefited from its operation, that the feed grains program be continued. But there is always room for improvement, and I endorse the President's recommendation.

Allowing farmers to raise soybeans on some of the land diverted from feed grain production should add flexibility to the program, reduce the overall cost to the Government, and increase farm income for those participating in the program.

Moreover, by increasing soybean production, the change should bolster America's farm export position. There is now a heavy demand abroad for soybeans and it is estimated that the United States will need at least 200 million bushels for export this year, if it is to maintain its competitive position in the world market. And, as the President pointed out in his message yesterday, the welfare of American agriculture is linked closely to foreign trade.

The Congress still has before it the job of enacting specific legislation in specific areas of agriculture. That will not be an easy task. But the general philosophy of the President's message is a most encouraging point from which to begin.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on agriculture outlined a program which is broad in purview, yet sensitive to the needs of the individual farmer and the specific problems of rural America. The message puts in proper perspective the invaluable role of agriculture in the national economy and should serve to repudiate any suggestion that this administration is only interested in a fraction of American farm families. It represents instead a rededication to our goals of preserving the family farm and expanding opportunities throughout our rural areas.

I am particularly gratified that any doubts about renewing the successful feed grains program were resolved with the President's recommendation that it be extended and improved. Since its inception this valuable program has contributed substantially both to farm income and the reduction in surplus production of these commodities.

The President has properly emphasized the correlative nature and the mutual interdependency of agricultural policy and our trade and foreign policy objectives. We must pledge ourselves to continued efforts to develop world markets for our agricultural abundance, and to the wise use of that abundance through the food-for-peace program as an effective step toward our goals of economic security and political stability throughout the world.

While enacting programs to assist economic development in rural areas, we have too often overlooked the necessity of providing for their implementation and initiation in the vitally affected areas. I, therefore, am extremely pleased with the President's request that the Secretary of Agriculture create a Rural Community Development Service to aid other Government agencies in making their services more readily available in rural areas. I have previously discussed this problem with the Secretary and officials in the Department of Agriculture with a view toward the establishment of an office to consult with representatives of rural areas and coordinate Government programs so as to better assist them in realizing the full benefits of existing programs to revitalize and preserve small towns. I hope that we may assist in any appropriate manner the valuable functions of this proposed office.

I also wish to offer my support for the President's proposal for creating reserve stocks of agricultural commodities. This will insure an adequate reserve of vital agricultural commodities to satisfy na-

tional security and emergency needs while at the same time properly separating the cost of this critical program from that of farm price and income support programs.

The message clearly indicates that it is the policy of this administration to insure freedom of choice and opportunity for rural Americans and not an impersonal and insensitive program of economic attrition and disaster to drive people from the land. As a communication of challenge, and yet of hope, it establishes an appropriate basis for congressional review of our agricultural policy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CALLAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, the message on agriculture by the President will give confidence not only to farmers but to the whole agricultural community.

One of the most significant paragraphs in the message is the one which reads:

Farm policy is not something separate. It is a part of an overall effort to serve our national interest at home and around the world.

If the Congress will attack the problems of agriculture with this philosophy, then farm legislation can be written which will be indeed in the best interest of not only the American farmer but every segment of the national economy.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. REDLIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's longstanding concern for rural America is reflected in his message on agriculture. I feel certain, moreover, that the President requested and received invaluable counsel from another friend of agriculture, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

Those of us from rural areas are reassured by the message, which places in perspective the vital role of agriculture in the national economy. As a Representative of North Dakota, I am particularly pleased by the emphasis on continuing and improving the wheat and feed grain programs.

I realize, of course, that the message necessarily sets forth general concepts and that exhaustive work remains in filling in the details, but the message provides a good framework with which to begin.

GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, no problem is born big. It reaches the acute, dangerous state because we are unaware of its evolution or choose to ignore it. Neither reason can be justified by men of responsibility.

The recognition of the problem is necessarily the first barrier to be broken down. In many instances it is the major barrier.

What I am discussing today was officially recognized and described in broad outline little more than 3 months ago. At that particular time there was a more immediate problem facing our constituents and the Members of this Chamber. This overshadowed the significance and importance of the report made by the House Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development.

In the report it was pointed out 15 percent of the total Federal budget is directed toward the Government's research and development needs. An expenditure of this size cannot help but have a marked influence upon the course of events. It has a direct influence on the expansion of the body of knowledge and the development of new products. It has a major effect on the ebb and flow of scientific and technical manpower between sections of the country. It is playing an increasingly important role in the economy of the various sections of the Nation. These influences will not wane in this century—nor are they likely to in the next century.

The increase in knowledge, the development of new products, more efficient and economical processes are to be desired and sought after. But all of this is not taking place without some undesired and widespread side effects.

One of these side effects has been described by Dr. Elvis Stahr as a "brain drain." Dr. Stahr, a former Secretary of the Army and now president of Indiana University, is not talking about a surgical technique. He is pointing to the migration of vitally important manpower between different sections of the Nation. The prognosis for the areas suffering this "brain drain" is not critical at this time. The deterioration to such a point can take many years. But to ignore treating the symptoms now can only aggravate the condition and speed up the decline.

The Middle West is a major producer of scientific and engineering talent. During the decade of the fifties the major universities in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin produced about one-third of all the doctorate degrees in the biological sciences and engineering. The same institutions awarded roughly one-fourth of all the doctorate degrees in the physical sciences and mathematics. But despite these numbers this reservoir of talent—of intellect—is being drained away by those sections of the country which have benefited most by the sudden expansion of Government research and development funds. This expansion of funds has ballooned from less than 1 percent of the Federal budget 20 years ago to 15 percent today.

The expansion of knowledge stimulates industrial growth. The demand for more

scientists and engineers with advanced degrees pyramids. This in turn translated into greater demands for expansion of graduate study facilities and a corresponding increase in graduate school faculties.

Here we find the universities caught in a pressure squeeze. It becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the proper ratio between teacher and graduate student enrollment. There is the vital need for the maintenance and expansion of research programs. The potential faculty member faces a choice between the university and industry. He can have a combination of both offered in those sections of the Nation blessed with a heavy concentration of research and development fund allocations.

The Middle West has not been standing still. Indiana University, for example, is now spending almost six times as much money in its research programs as it did just 10 years ago. The other great universities of this area can point to similar tremendous increases in research. But still the competition for their homegrown talent continues at a furious pace as the concentration of Government research and development funds in other areas is increased.

My remarks up to now have been concerned with the effect of ratio of research and development fund allocations upon the educational field. I now want to discuss briefly another side effect which could assume tremendous proportions in the decades ahead. This is the effect of such activity on the basic economies of various sections of the country.

A recent report issued by the Department of Commerce describes a similar geographical pattern. In this case it is concerned with changes in the relative shares of personal income that each region of the Nation receives.

This analysis reveals a significant geographical redistribution of income over the postwar years. The southern and western regions have increased their share of the national total of personal income by 15 percent while the northeastern and central sections have recorded a decline of the same amount.

Three growth components were considered in this analysis. The first is the overall growth of our national economy. If all regional characteristics had remained the same there would have, naturally, been no redistribution recorded. Two other factors provide the key for the change. One is the factor of industry mix and the other is the regional shifts within individual industries.

In the industry-mix factor each industry's national growth rate is measured against the national all-industry growth rate. This provides the composition of rapid and slow growth industries within a particular area.

The regional shift factor measures the rate of growth of a particular industry in a particular area against the industry's national growth rate. The declines in the share of participation income received in New England, the Mideast, and the Great Lakes region have taken place because four-fifths of their industries suffered reductions in their share of corresponding industry national totals.

I think it can be considered significant that those sections of the Nation which have shown increases in income are the same areas which have received the major share of Government research and development funds.

I do not maintain the geographic distribution of such funds is the only—or even the major reason—for rapid growth in one area. Nor do I imply a smaller share of such funds is the major reason for a slowing down in the rate of growth in another area.

But I do maintain it is having an effect and it is a subject which requires the most serious consideration and study.

I believe it is imperative we attain a better adjustment between the immediate goals of research and development and the long term goal of establishing a broadened national competence in research and development. I am convinced such a move will go far toward correcting the imbalance which is developing between regions.

We are facing a fundamental problem which can create weak links in the chain of our national economy. It is not yet a big problem. It can become one. The time to begin corrective action is now. It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to expand on this subject in the immediate future with specific recommendations.

FSLA LOANS FOR HOUSEHOLD GOODS AND FURNISHINGS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced H.R. 4289 to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to make loans for major household durable goods and furnishings.

These items of property physically constitute a home as much as the outside structure of shelter. Since the lending institutions have already determined such vital information as the borrowers credit and repayment record, they are readily equipped to extend further credit for home furnishings.

The enactment of this legislation should result in lower interest charges for this type of lending for the benefit of the homeowner and the consumer.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT WITH REFERENCE TO AID TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the majority of my colleagues for voting to cut off any further aid to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480.

Circumstances compelled me to be in Arizona on January 26, 1965, when this

vital matter came before the House for consideration. Had I been here, however, I would have voted to end this self-defeating, degrading policy of aiding a cynical and dangerous foreign power.

President Nasser has at last been made to clearly understand that he cannot continue to slap the face of America with one hand and at the same time accept its bounty with the other.

Perhaps the other body will not concur in the action taken by the House. Yet, even so, the world now knows that the patience of Americans is wearing thin. There is much we will endure in the cause of peace, but all too many nations have confused tolerance with weakness. We are setting the record straight.

VA CLOSURES ARE NOT IRREVOCABLE

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the other body was successful in placing a rider on the supplemental agricultural appropriations bill prohibiting expenditure of funds to implement recent directives by the Veterans' Administration closing 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries in all parts of the United States. Within a short time House conferees will have to decide whether to agree with or recede from this particular amendment to the bill.

Assent to the rider sponsored by the Senators from South Dakota and New Mexico is not the only way this House can express dissatisfaction with decisions announced on that black 13th of January 1965. But it is one of the most effective ways to do so under the circumstances at hand. The rider is not only timely, but it serves as a sharp reprimand to the Veterans' Administration for the highhanded manner in which they made and announced their hurried decision.

The other body has presented those of us in the House who are concerned about the closing of 32 VA facilities a rare opportunity to make it crystal clear to the new Administrator and his associates the feelings of the House on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, my present remarks are not directed solely to those Members whose districts are affected by the proposed closing of facilities. Of course those Members who have suffered a loss of a VA facility should emphasize the importance of this amendment to the conferees. But every other Member of the House who believes that there should not be a reduction or impairment of adequate services to our veteran population should also be interested in sustaining the action of the other body.

I respectfully urge the House conferees to accept and agree to the rider, notwithstanding any points of order that will undoubtedly be evoked. Further implementation of the VA's highly ques-

tionable decision should be brought to a grinding halt—or as they say in some parts of the country, to a "sliding whoa"—until both Houses of Congress have conducted complete and thorough investigations of the whole affair.

The capable and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has promised such an investigation. Adoption of the rider attached by the other body will insure that hearings do not become polite tea parties which take up a lot of time in fruitless discussion. Let us not be party to any thinking that the decision is irrevocable.

LONG-RANGE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President's statement in his farm message that "farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system," but I doubt that he could convince many American farmers that they have that kind of freedom today under his wheat, feed grains, cotton, and tobacco programs.

Our farmers could, however, have the freedom that the President says he wants for them by enacting the farm bill I am introducing today.

I have long advocated the adoption of a long-range cropland adjustment program, and I am pleased to learn that the President is now supporting such an approach to our farm problems. Such a program is included in my bill, and I shall do all that I can to see that such a plan is adopted. However, the President fails to recommend corrective legislation necessary to return the freedom to the farmers producing crops that he says they should have. My bill does this. I would, for example, eliminate all marketing quotas and allotment programs for wheat and feed grains and give the farmer the freedom to plant on his own land what he wants without fear of penalty. A floor—rather than a ceiling—of the average world market price during the preceding 3 years would be available to all wheat producers and our feed grains would have a floor of not less than 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the last 3 years. The sale of CCC stocks at less than 125 percent of the prevailing support levels plus reasonable carrying charges would be prohibited. A program patterned after these guidelines would give our farmers the freedom they want and the freedom the President has referred to in his message.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. Yes. I will be very pleased to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman on his statement and speak in support of the

legislation he has introduced. To me it is a very potent measure which is now before the Committee on Agriculture. It is apparent from the President's statement that he has expressed an interest at least in a part of this proposal, and I join the gentleman in hoping that he will adopt the entire proposal.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I need not point out to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], is a member of our Committee on Agriculture and is one of its most respected members. I welcome his support of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SLOWDOWN IN THE PENTAGON

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of Foreign Affairs, there is an outstanding article by the well-known author on military affairs, Hanson Baldwin. Very appropriately entitled "Slowdown in the Pentagon," the article clearly and concisely reviews the current state of our defenses and the decisions that led to our present condition. Even more important, it reveals the thinking of those principally charged with the responsibility of those decisions. It quickly becomes apparent that the thinking and dictates of Congress have been largely ignored.

Those of us who sit on the committees responsible for national security have begun our hearings to review new budgets and proposals. I urge all of my colleagues who are concerned directly or indirectly with national security to read the very fine analysis by Hanson Baldwin. Accordingly, I insert the article, "Slowdown in the Pentagon," by Hanson Baldwin, in the Record at this point:

SLOWDOWN IN THE PENTAGON

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

In 1947, the "bible" of the Nation's military contractors—Armed Forces Procurement Regulations—was a slim volume about 100 to 125 pages long. Today, the AFPR, which governs in minute detail all those who do business with the Pentagon, has expanded to four huge volumes totaling something like 1,200 pages, with new ones added daily.

Five to seven years ago, according to a careful statistical average compiled by one major defense contractor, it required 4 to 5 months to execute a contract from the time an acceptable price quotation was received in the Pentagon to the time the contractor received the final document. Today, the same contractor estimates that an average of 9 to 12 months is needed for the same process; a very few may be completed in 30 days; some may require 23 months.

Parkinson's law of bureaucracy—the less there is to do the more people it takes to do it, and the simpler the problem the longer the time required for the solution—appears to be operating in Washington, particularly in defense contracting. There are many reasons for this state of affairs.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, the apostle of cost-effectiveness these past 4 years, must share the blame for many of them as well as the credit for some improved management procedures. But the lengthening delays in the development and production of new weapons started long before he took office, and no one man, no one cause, is responsible.

A rough rule of thumb used to hold that it required about 7 years (in the United States) from the gleam in the eye of the designer to the finished operational product. This time span, which has been compared unfavorably with the lead time required for the development and production of new weapons in Russia, has been steadily lengthening, and there is no sign at the moment that the process is being checked.

Even more important, there appears to have been in the first half of the 1960's a definite reduction, as compared to the 1950-60 period, in the evolution and production of new weapons. The Republicans protest too much when they allege that the Pentagon, under Mr. McNamara, has not produced a single new weapons system. But it is at least true that virtually all the major—and most of the minor—weapons systems in operation or in development today (Polaris, Minuteman; B-70, TFX, or F-111; AR-15 rifle, etc.) were already in production, development or in preliminary design and specification form back in the 1950's. The Pentagon in recent years has certainly instituted some much-needed management reforms, effected some economies and added considerably to our ready strategic strength and our conventional war and general support forces. But it has probably canceled more development contracts (the nuclear-powered aircraft Dynasoar; the mobile medium-range ballistic missile Skybolt, etc.) than it has initiated new ones.

Two principal and telling criticisms have been leveled at the Pentagon's present policies, trends and procedures by scientists who can be in no way accused of political parochialism.

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., chairman of the Corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, cautioned recently against an attitude that is too prevalent in and outside of the Pentagon—a belief that the technological revolution is over. No one in the Pentagon has ever explicitly stated such a belief, but the attitude of skeptical show-meism widely held there acts as a very definite brake upon the excited enthusiasm which should energize new research projects. Mr. McNamara's "whiz kids," complete with slide rules and computers, brushed aside the factor of professional judgment or scientific hunch when they took office and their emphasis upon "perfection on paper" and the cost part of the cost-effectiveness formula has definitely slowed the pace of military development.

Behind this attitude in the Pentagon is an even broader trend. Part of it is a belief expressed by many scientists—notably by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and Dr. Herbert F. York in a recent issue of *Scientific American*—that disarmament, or arms limitation, is the only way to political salvation, and that therefore continued technological military development worsens the situation. This somewhat simplistic viewpoint has had an increasing public and political appeal and indeed has its adherents in the Defense Department. And even so hardheaded a man as Representative Melvin Price, chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittees of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, recently warned that "we are entering a leveling-off period, a plateau, in the total dimensions" of the Government's research program. This feeling of disillusionment on the part of scientists, and of fear of economic limitations on future breakthroughs in weapons research, comes

at a time when the military technological revolution is far from finished.

Despite our present great strength, Dr. Killian has said, we cannot "rest on our oars," thinking the race is won. "We may be only at the beginning of unexampled scientific and engineering achievement," he notes, and the "high confidence" and sheer size of the present research and development effort may "obscure weaknesses still present in our program and lead us once again into complacency."

The second major criticism leveled at present weapons development policies comes from James T. Ramey, Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, and Dr. Edward C. Welsh, acting chairman of the National Aeronautics Space Council. Mr. Ramey in a recent speech urged the Government to rid itself of what he called the requirements merry-go-round. He pointed out that every new project had to be justified on the basis of military requirements, and that many promising developments—particularly in space—could never be pushed, or even demonstrated, if development had to wait for the establishment of requirements. Invention has never followed this path; the machinegun and the tank would still remain blueprint dreams if their development had awaited the specifications of clear-cut military requirements. One cannot state a requirement for an inventor's hopes. As Dr. Welsh has pointed out, "If we had required a clear-cut prior mission, we would probably have developed no airplanes, no spacecraft, or, in fact, no wheel."

Other causes for the delays in development and production of new weapons have their roots in the past, well prior to the present administration, and the responsibility extends far beyond the Pentagon. A \$50 billion annual defense budget attracts the eager interests of many government agencies.

The sprawling bureaucracy of big government; the control of major military or paramilitary projects by agencies over which the Defense Department has no direct authority, including the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of the Budget; congressional legislation and executive regulation—social, political and economic; the tremendous size and complexity of the Armed Forces; overcentralization and overregulation in the Pentagon; too much service rivalry and not enough service competition—all these and other factors have become built-in roadblocks in defense development and contracting.

Big government itself is undeniably one of the roadblocks to speedy performance. Everybody must get in on the act, particularly if a new development project involves sizable sums of money or promises numerous jobs, or involves systems or components which must be provided by foreign governments or by other agencies of government.

Development of nuclear weapons and nuclear engines is the responsibility of the AEC, yet the only users are the military, and they develop the devices which carry warheads and the vehicles which use the propulsion systems. Over the years, an effective system of liaison by interchange of officers, by committees and other means has made the AEC quickly responsive to military needs, but the mere process of two-headed control slows and complicates the system.

LASV (low altitude supersonic vehicle) provides an enlightening case history of how many heads produce many purposes, and no final results. LASV was once hailed as a highly promising project. The AEC was to develop a nuclear-powered ramjet engine and the Pentagon would use the engine to power a pilotless atmospheric missile, capable of indefinite flight (perhaps 10 times around the world) at 3 times the speed

of sound. The weapon was envisaged as a possible future successor to, or supplement for, ballistic missiles in case the Russians should develop—as they now appear to be doing—an antiballistic missile. In this instance the AEC, after overcoming many technical difficulties in its part of the job, was on the verge of outstanding success and was ready to flight-test the engine, when Mr. McNamara, reversing prior judgments—and as Dr. Edward Teller put it, for "the sake of an economy that amounts to less than 1 percent of the Air Force budget"—canceled the project after a prior investment of nearly \$200 million. Dr. Teller was caustic: "I believe this is the biggest mistake we have made since the years following World War II when we failed to develop the ICBM."

Whether Dr. Teller is correct or not in his assessment of the importance of such a weapon, the fate of LASV is illustrative both of prevalent negativistic Pentagon philosophy about new weapons systems and of the difficulties of developing new systems under hydra-headed controls.

The creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has provided another type of problem. NASA stemmed from the same kind of political philosophy that nurtured the AEC. Atom bombs were too powerful to allow the generals to play with them; ergo, a civilian agency must control nuclear power—and it must be channeled away from nasty military purposes. The same scientific-political pressure groups that advocated this concept helped (with President Eisenhower's approval) to establish NASA, again on the theory that space efforts must be controlled by civilians and that space must not be used for military purposes. The pragmatic absurdities of this point of view are now self-evident; nuclear power so far has been more important in the military weapons and military propulsion field than in any other way, and the most important applications of space technology have been military—reconnaissance satellites, weather satellites, missile-warning and navigational satellites.

But in the case of NASA, the problem has been compounded. For while the AEC is essentially a research and production agency, NASA is an operating agency as well. From a small highly efficient aeronautical research agency, it has now expanded into a gargantuan multibillion-dollar empire, with tentacles all over the country, managing the biggest program on which the United States has ever embarked—to place a man on the moon.

In its early years, NASA was sluggishly if at all responsive to military needs, and the Pentagon itself was inhibited from any effective space developments (though, curiously, the only effective space boosters available were military ballistic missiles). Gradually the liaison, due to Dr. Welsh and others, has been greatly improved. Numerous military officers, active and retired, now hold some of the most important positions in NASA, and in addition the Armed Forces have furnished most of the astronauts and by far the most important part of the facilities and services used by the agency. The two-headed control still offers difficulties, but today the main stumbling blocks to the rapid development of military space projects are Secretary McNamara and his Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. Harold Brown, who in his new political role in the Pentagon has become a remarkably unadventurous scientist.

Often the President's Scientific Adviser, whose contacts with Pentagon and other Government scientists cut squarely across organizational lines, has also acted as a roadblock to new developments. He exercises tremendous power without either specific responsibility or specific authority; therefore, his intervention often not only delays but confuses. The Adviser's great power stems

largely from his White House status; unfortunately around him has grown up a small but important office manned by men more impressive as bureaucrats than as scientists, who represent, in effect, another echelon of delay. The old bogey of "no military requirements" has been invoked again and again by the Defense Department, with tacit support of scientists outside the Department, to stifle projects aborning particularly in the military space field.

The Central Intelligence Agency is another organization which has gradually usurped some of what were once primarily military functions. Two factors—the creation of the Agency and its tremendous increase in power, and the creation by Mr. McNamara of a Defense Intelligence Agency outside and above the service chain of command, and directly responsive to him—have greatly reduced the importance of the now emasculated service intelligence agencies—G-2, A-2, and the Office of Naval Intelligence. The service chiefs no longer sit as members of the U.S. Intelligence Board, the governing policymaking organ of the defense community. In operations as well as in procurement the results are still another proliferation of agencies and committees. The fiasco of the Bay of Pigs—a military operation run principally by the CIA instead of by the Pentagon—is one example of the kind of problems this expansion of the executive department can produce. And until recently the CIA—not the Army—was operating the Army's own special forces counterinsurgency troops in South Vietnam.

The new centralized organization of intelligence can also affect weapons procurement, for military requirements must be measured in part against Soviet capabilities; if the centralized control of intelligence reduces those capabilities, obviously force levels and weapons requirements are altered. This is not an imaginary problem. For instance, the strength and speed of mobilization of the Soviet Army has been sharply reduced, in the Pentagon's intelligence estimates, during the McNamara administration.

The Bureau of the Budget with its pervasive influence over the source of all power—the dollar—has now developed military "experts" who literally can doom a weapons system or foster its growth. Even Congress' watchdog—the Comptroller General—has become his own "expert" on tactics and military supply.

Thus the "advice"—and the actual control—exercised on military projects by executive agencies outside the Pentagon is sweeping but almost completely negative. They delay and they criticize and they inhibit; they do not expedite.

Congressional legislation and executive regulation complicate, restrict and delay research and procurement contracts. The contractor must comply with hundreds of laws or executive orders. Accounting procedures, minimum wages, civil rights, veterans' preferences, subcontracting, profit limitations and so on and so forth, all are roadblocks to speed. The Armed Forces procurement regulations reflects in its bulk, size and complexity how social, political and economic considerations, as well as those that are military and technical, influence the awards of contracts.¹

¹ AFPR regulations require the proposals of the contractor to be reviewed before submission by engineering, pricing, auditing, data, legal, civil rights, subcontracting and many other experts, and in turn various Pentagon and Government agencies must review the proposals for compliance. Even so, AFPR regulations are sometimes vaguely worded. A Congressional investigating subcommittee recently requested the Department of Defense to alter those regulations dealing with employee health and recreation expenses. The wording of some of the regulations permitted the charge-off of losses

Economic considerations—the need, for instance, to funnel defense contracts into depressed areas—and political pressure—the need to win an election or placate a pressure group—play their part in consideration and delay in contracts. Normally, as the TFX investigation brought out, no major defense contract is awarded without Presidential approval, and the Democratic (or as the case may be, the Republican) National Committee representatives always have their opportunity to urge contractual rewards to the party faithful. The F-111 (TFX) contract went to the General Dynamics Fort Worth plant, although the services in three separate evaluations preferred the Boeing proposal. Many in Washington believe this was the result of political pressure.

All of these practices—all of this red tape—"jest grew" as part of big Government and a big defense budget.

II

But the major causes of recent delays are to be found in the Pentagon itself, and they stem from the overcentralized organization established by Mr. McNamara and the attempts made to achieve perfection on paper before any steel is bent.

Centralization—"unification," the public calls it—has been steadily increasing, particularly since the passage of the 1958 modifications to the National Security Act. But Mr. McNamara has used the power every Secretary of Defense has always had to a far greater extent than any predecessor. There is no doubt that he has run the show. Any major contract must be approved by him; even relatively minor modifications must pass the gauntlet of his numerous assistants.

The checkreins Secretary McNamara has used were, without doubt, needed to halt the proliferation of unneeded weapons systems and the expenditure of billions on projects that turned out to be "duds" or duplications of others.

It is an axiom of sound military research practices that in the early stages two or more parallel lines of development should be followed leading to the same end—a weapons system of given characteristics. In case an unexpected engineering problem of insuperable difficulty is encountered in one developmental effort, the second may offer an alternative. But to avoid unnecessary duplication and expense once the teething troubles are over one of the two lines should be abandoned and full efforts concentrated on the more hopeful one. In the pre-McNamara era this decision was often left until too late. This was the case, for instance, when the Air Force developed the Thor intermediate-range ballistic missile and the Army developed Jupiter. Because of service rivalries and pressures, both missiles were developed to final "hardware" stage and both were produced in small but expensive quantities, although one virtually duplicated the other and either could have done the job of both. Mr. McNamara, therefore, had some justification for his show-me attitude and for the elaborate system he has established of evaluating and analyzing all new projects. But he or "the system" has overcompensated. The cost part of the cost-effectiveness formula has been emphasized and underscored at the expense of speedy development and new ideas. Never in the history of competition have so many been able to say no, so few to say yes.²

for operating factory cafeterias, and contractors could also charge cocktail parties to the taxpayer if they were billed as "employee welfare."

² Management experts and contractors have pointed out that the exercise of centralized control by the Department of Defense over the services requires information and reports from the services. The self-generating and self-defeating nature of the workload im-

In the past, technological development and research and procurement contracting were largely decentralized; the individual services were responsible to a major degree for their own weapons development. Service competition, in the happiest sense, produced the air-cooled aircraft engine (sponsored by the Navy) and the liquid-cooled engine (sponsored by the then Army Air Corps) with which the United States fought and won World War II in the air. One without the other would have been incomplete; service competition produced both.

When a new aircraft was required, the service needing it determined the characteristics wanted to perform the specialized missions contemplated. Competitive contracts were then let for a small number of planes, and actual flight competitions between competing companies were held, with the big payoff production contract going to the contractor who built the best plane, as actually determined in the air.

The services formerly had, within overall policy and budget limitations, a considerable degree of autonomy, and weapons development and procurement were largely decentralized. What can be done when red tape is cut, authority and responsibility are coupled, and organization is decentralized to the working levels is shown by the production of the Polaris missile and the A-11 aircraft. The highly successful and extremely complex Polaris was pushed to completion as an operational weapon in about 3½ years, well ahead of schedule. One man, Vice Adm. W. F. Raborn, was given authority and responsibility to cut across organizational lines, and he was fully backed by the Navy and the Department of Defense. There was then no such centralization in the Pentagon as exists now. The A-11, successor to the famed U-2 high flying reconnaissance plane, was a secret project, amply funded by the CIA and by the Air Force. With ample funds, full authority and responsibility, and a high degree of autonomy, Lockheed Aircraft was twice able to produce—in the U-2 and its successor—world-beating aircraft in an abbreviated time span. Similarly, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who wore two hats—one Navy, one AEC—and whose authority therefore spanned the bifurcated organizational structure, was able to produce what was essentially a new weapons system with minimum delay. The key to these and other successful development and production efforts is the coupling of authority and responsibility at working levels.

Today the entire picture has changed violently. Under the law, separate service departments must be maintained and the services cannot be directly merged; Mr. McNamara has merged them indirectly, as John C. Ries points out in his new book.³ A fourth service—the Office of the Secretary of Defense—has been built up as an all-powerful apex. It is far more than a policymaking and coordinating agency, as it was originally intended to be under the National Security Act of 1947; it administers, operates, contracts, develops, procures, and commands. Superagencies, superimposed over the service departments, are answerable only to the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Former service functions have been assumed by the Defense Supply Agency, which procures items common to the services; by the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency (communications, intelli-

posed becomes apparent. The tighter and more centralized the control, the more reports that are required. The more authority taken away from the working level, the more paperwork that is required from those at the working level to back up their diminished authority.

³ "The Management of Defense." Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1964.

gence, and security; codes and ciphers, etc.), the Defense Communications Agency (common and long-lines communications) and the Defense Atomic Support Agency. These have added new superchelons to the Pentagon bureaucracy.

Mr. McNamara came into office intending—he let it be known—to streamline top echelon Defense Department management. There were some 15 Presidential appointees of the rank of Assistant Secretary of Defense or higher in January 1961 when he took office; there are 16 today. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are about 30 today.

The Joint Staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was originally limited by law by Congress to 100 officers, then increased to 400, a specific limit intended to prevent the development of a super-General Staff; it now numbers the full 400, plus another 1,170 military and civilian personnel. The additional personnel are labeled members of the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a euphemism which permits evasion of the legal restriction (with both executive department and Congress winking at the extralegality). This staff, rich with rank, now has three lieutenant generals or vice admirals assigned to head its more important sections or divisions, and its director—a three-star general—may be given four stars if current suggestions are carried out.

As one would expect with a gigantic staff which tends to generate its own paperwork, the workload of the Joint Chiefs of Staff steadily increases—from 887 papers or reports requiring some action by the JCS in 1958 to about double that number today. Something like a de facto hierarchical general staff now exists, with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs as a kind of overall Chief of Staff; and it busies itself with the ridiculous and the petty as well as the crucial and important. (The Joint Chiefs, for instance, determine the details of the administration and curriculum of the National War College and other joint service schools and have even solemnly considered such important matters as the advisability of establishing an all-service soccer team which might compete with European all stars, and the numbers of cooks, and which services should furnish them, for a U.S. headquarters in Europe.) Representative CHARLES S. GUBSER, of California, has estimated that there are now a total of some 34,000 employees responsible to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (exclusive of separate service departments in Washington). Statistics like these indicate the revolutionary changes that have occurred within the Pentagon in the past 15, particularly in the past 4, years. As Mr. Ries puts it, the dogma of centralization has triumphed.

Many beside Mr. Ries worry about the capability of the present defense organization to withstand the strain of real war or protracted crises. There have been some disturbing signs of faltering and confusion during the Berlin crisis, the Cuban missile crisis, and one of the Gulf of Tonkin incidents.

The present Secretary of Defense has a computer mind, capable of absorbing and recording immense quantities of detailed data. He also has ferocious energy. The combination of these two qualities has enabled him, so far, to deal with what Mr. Ries calls the minutiae that floods upward in a centralized organization. But even Mr. McNamara has several times given evidence of strain, and after Mr. McNamara, who? To decentralize the Department so that the Secretary could have time, opportunity, and assistance to cope with major decisions would require a decrease rather than an increase in the staff of the Secretary, something that no democratic bureaucracy seems capable of accomplishing.

The centralized organization of the Pentagon and the accompanying growth of a bu-

reaucracy—particularly in the upper echelons—explain in part the delays in development and procurement of new weapons systems. In effect, responsibility and authority have been separated in the Pentagon. Vice Admiral Rickover gave several instances of delays caused by bureaucracy in testimony to a Senate committee in 1958. Purchase of nuclear cores was delayed for 6 months “just because one staff person with no responsibility but with authority had on his own decided” against the purchase. In March 1964, he testified before a House Appropriations Subcommittee on the question of nuclear power for a new aircraft carrier. The carrier itself was already approved by both Congress and the Defense Department. The Navy and most Congressmen felt that such a major new investment should be as modern as possible, and that it should be powered with nuclear reactors rather than with oil, even though the initial cost would be considerably greater. But the subject was studied to death. Admiral Rickover testified: “The Department of Defense itself caused much of the delay. They considered the Navy’s request to change it to a nuclear carrier for a year. The Department of Defense kept on asking for more information, more studies, more analyses. New studies and analyses are underway now on nuclear propulsion for the next carrier and other surface ships. These studies never end, and we don’t build ships.”

The services still have the legal responsibility for development and procurement but not the authority to implement their responsibility. Similarly the responsibility for planning and execution has been separated. The Joint Chiefs no longer legally command anything; in the procurement field the services must often execute or carry out procurement plans they have not formulated (i.e. the TFX).

In an admirable attempt to promote some much-needed long-range planning in the Armed Forces and to control costs, Mr. McNamara instituted what is called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, often dubbed “the book.” “The book” tries to chart and elaborate all major details of service force structures (including sizes, types) and weapons systems required, being procured or developed, for the next 5 years. Any significant change in “the book,” including research expenditures, requires consideration by hundreds of people, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary himself, and an elaborate process of justification, review, and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting, budgeting, progress on weapons systems—and even lawn cutting—are programmed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary’s office, with streams of reports required. The services have complained that there is an inherent, built-in inflexibility and rigidity in this system.

In addition to the Secretary of Defense and his deputy and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the 1,570 supporting staff, all of the Assistant Secretaries of Defense have become, not de jure, but de facto, line operators as well as staff assistants. By virtue of authority delegated by the Secretary, they can and do cut across service lines and intervene at the lowest echelons. Two offices, in particular, have a major influence in weapons development and procurement; unfortunately they are to often delaying factors rather than expeditors.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Controller) has completely changed its character under the McNamara regime. Charles J. Hitch, the incumbent, has, with the Secretary’s approval, applied the methods he developed as an economic theorist at the Rand Corp. to military strategic programming. The cost effectiveness of various weapons systems is analyzed on paper by his office, and he and his associates have a powerful

voice in determining what kind of weapon will do to what service. Dr. Brown, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, does another analytical job, supposedly from the technical and engineering feasibility point of view. His analyses are particularly important in the research and development stages.

Any projected weapons system has to run the gauntlet between the Charybdis of Mr. Hitch and the Scylla of Dr. Brown; but many other high and low echelon perils confront it also. The McNamara administration has established “for all large endeavors” (and for some that are not so large) what it calls a Project Definition Phase (PDP in Pentagon jargon). In Secretary McNamara’s words, “before full-scale development is initiated, the specific operational requirements and the cost effectiveness of the system must be confirmed, and goals, milestones, and time schedules must be established. * * * All the aspects of a development are tied together into a single plan which defines, for Government and industry alike, what is wanted, how it is to be designed and built, how it will be used, what it will cost, and what systems and techniques will be used to manage the program. * * *

The PDP represents the Pentagon’s search for “perfection on paper” before any operation begins. There is no doubt that it is an attractive theoretical management tool, but here is also not much doubt that it has delayed development and procurement of new weapons systems, and whether or not the end result in the form of “finished hardware” is actually any better or less expensive, it is still too soon to tell.⁴ The TFX (F-111) aircraft for the Air Force and Navy has been programmed and evaluated, analyzed, and costed in detail on paper in the “PDP”; it is still in the development stage and may not be operational for years to come.⁵ This

⁴ Stanley Bernstein, of the Raytheon Co., in a paper “The Impact of Project Definition on Aerospace System Management,” delivered at the first annual meeting of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (June 29-July 2, 1964), used the mobile medium-range ballistic missile as a case history. He pointed out that contractors were expected to meet some 20 different requirements in a final PDP report, “one may consider the several contractors who participated in the MMRBM effort,” he said. “Even prior to Department of Defense program authorization in January 1962, companies like Hughes, Thiokol, Martin, and many others had been engaged in significant engineering efforts. When program definition was authorized, originally as a 4-month effort, nine prime companies and many sub-contractors and suppliers geared for maximum effort. The 4 months stretched to almost 1 year. Motivation has to be maintained. The present status of MMRBM is clouded. [Since this paper, MMRBM has been virtually killed.] Yet the participants must retain a level of interest in order to be ready to proceed if the program should become active. The maintenance of this motivation is a major management challenge. The requirement for stated performance incentive goals will, inevitably, lead to more conservative design and engineering during the program definition phase. * * * FD contracts should not be used as a means of postponing difficult government decisions or to decide what kind of military capability is required.”

⁵ The practice of “superstudy” is extending beyond the Pentagon. The SST, or supersonic commercial transport, is now called the super-studied transport. Najeeb E. Halaby, head of the Federal Aviation Agency, recently said that “whether or not it ever flies, it will easily be the most analyzed project in the Government’s history.” If so, this is quite a record.

plane, which can vary the sweep of its wings (their angle to the fuselage) in flight, was forced into a preconceived and theoretical mold in the PD phase. Mr. McNamara insisted, against service objections, that Navy needs and Air Force needs could be satisfied by a single all-purpose plane, which could be flown from land fields and carrier decks on several entirely different types of missions. The attempt to achieve this—in theory and in blueprint form—required many months before designs acceptable to both services were evolved. The development contract was finally awarded to Convair and the first of the developmental TFX planes is nearing completion. The Navy fears the finished version may be too heavy for carrier decks.

The finest fighter in the world today, the Navy's McDonnell F-4B Phantom II, which the Air Force is now buying in quantity in a slightly modified version, was the product of flight competition back in the fifties when the PDP in its present rigid form was unheard of, and centralization in the Pentagon had not reached today's extreme. The McDonnell and Chance-Vought aircraft companies, in response to a Navy need for a supersonic fighter of certain given specifications, were each awarded developmental contracts for a small number of planes. The results were then actually flight-tested in competition. McDonnell won, but the Chance-Vought product was also good and was procured in more limited quantities for specialized reconnaissance and other missions for the fleet.

Many believe that this type of flight and interservice competition produces the best dividends. One service evolves the plane or engine and (after actual competition between several bidders) contracts for and procures the one best suited to its own specialized needs. That one may well be adapted—after it is operational—to the needs of another service.* Each gets the type it wants, and a better plane or weapon than if it had been forced, on paper, into a common mold. For there frequently are incompatible requirements between service weapons systems, and the attempt to provide "commonality" in the interest of reducing costs may well increase cost and reduce combat effectiveness.

It is true, of course, that major weapons development projects have become far more complex and costly than they were 10 to 20 years ago. In theory, the attempt of the Department of Defense to define a project and to refine it on paper before the steel is bent has a great deal of attractiveness. Many authorities who are loud in condemning the delays of the PDP system do not believe it is economically feasible—at least in all cases—to return to the old era of actual competitive service tests. Others, however, think that competitive testing of several different models, while more expensive initially, may actually save money eventually, chiefly because it may result in a better product. Eugene E. Wilson, retired naval officer and retired vice chairman of United Aircraft Corp., wrote in the September-October 1964 issue of *Shipmate*, the magazine of the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association, that "the current practice of awarding production (and development) contracts to a single supplier, on the basis of contract guarantees unsubstantiated by competitive prototype performance * * * will not protect a hapless purchaser (the Government) willing to risk his all on computation." The

fundamental difficulty with PDP is that it has been invoked as an answer to all development and production problems, that it is interpreted too rigidly, and that there has been far too much dependence in the Department of Defense on what is essentially a management tool at the expense of judgment and engineering and scientific intuition.

It is only fair to add that recently the complaints of the services and of industry have resulted in a recognition in the Defense Department of some of these faults. A new and standardized procedure for rating, evaluating and selecting the winning contractors in a screening competition has been under preparation for 2 years and is now being presented—possibly for final approval—to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. For any large projects (exceeding \$100 million in production costs) authority will still remain at the highest levels; for smaller projects authority may be delegated to lower echelons. The procedure may—but probably will not—lessen the timelag; certainly it will not change the recent emphasis on "perfection on paper."

In the program definition phase of weapons development three high hurdles, in addition to countless evaluation procedures, cause many projects to stumble and fail.

One is the eruption of interservice rivalry instead of—in the best sense—interservice competition. A proposal for a new weapon or aircraft by one service is now picked to pieces and studied on paper by all services before even a minor development contract is approved. Now that their former degree of autonomy is restricted and actual development competition discouraged, the services know that the PD phase offers a now-or-never chance. Each service may produce a different concept or a different set of desired performance figures; a long hassle ensues to try to put them all into one weapons system. This occurred, notably, in the case of the TFX; it is happening now with the new Coin (counter-insurgency) aircraft which the Marines want to develop. The result is delay, sometimes a compromise as to performance.

A second factor causing delay and difficulties is the attempt by the Secretary's numerous assistants to eliminate what they call goldplating, or unnecessarily high performance figures or standards. The attempt is laudable, but it is sometimes carried to extremes, and it has been difficult, as Adm. George W. Anderson, former Chief of Naval Operations, pointed out, for men in uniform to adjust to the idea that a 10-mile-an-hour speed differential between our own aircraft and enemy planes may not—in the eyes of the Department of Defense—be important. To a pilot, that 10 miles an hour, even though costly in terms of dollars, may be the difference between life and death.

It is in the PD phase, too, that the old bogey of "no operational or military requirement" becomes a major obstacle to weapons development. It is invoked at both high and low levels. Mr. McNamara has been rigid—though with some signs of a slight relaxation recently—about the statement of specific needs before development can start. The "operational requirement," as an experienced naval officer puts it, "is another of the paper obstacles which are intended to insure proper planning but which, when operated by people who have no real knowledge of the problems involved, frustrate progress."

In the military exploitation of a new medium, like space, it is completely impossible to define, in the terms required by the PDP evaluations, the need for, or the performance characteristics of, a new vehicle. How can even a prescient scientist predict

what usefulness a manned orbiting laboratory will have? Yet the invocation of "no specific operational requirement" has delayed Air Force development of this highly important new project for at least 2 to 3 years.

Representative CHET HOLIFIELD's Military Operations Subcommittee of the House recently gave its view of what's wrong with the Pentagon. After a thorough study of Mr. McNamara's protracted efforts to merge military and commercial satellite systems, the subcommittee reported that 2 years had been wasted. It said: "We still detect uncertainty and overeconomizing in the Defense Department approach * * * there has been overmanagement and underperformance * * * too many layers of supervision, the lack of clear-cut responsibility * * * and sluggish channels of * * * communication."

Senator JOHN STENNIS, in common with many others, has decried the tendency to be negative, to object, to try to refine requirements in too much detail, to evaluate and study too much. Some weapons systems, he has said, "have literally been studied to death." He cites the B-70 (which dates back in inception to 1954) as a prime example of what happens to a weapons system development "when it is subjected to repeated stops and starts and when there is not a strong, orderly and continuous program to bring it to completion." This bomber, designed for long-range, high-altitude flights at three times the speed of sound, has encountered many technical difficulties and is well behind even a revised schedule. This was made certain by off-again-on-again programs in the Pentagon and by the multi-layered, centralized organization there.

Before a final contract for a project is signed and actual development starts, an average of at least 50 signatures or approvals is required—sometimes as many as 100 to 200. Some individuals, required by legal or administrative reasons to sign twice, have had to be briefed twice; by the time the second signature was needed they had forgotten what the contract was about.

It is true that centralization in the development and procurement field, epitomized by the 5-year force structure and the program definition phase, was in part the outgrowth of inadequate management by the services of some research and development contracts. It was also the result of the failure of past Secretaries of Defense to exercise the power they have always had by eliminating—not service competition—but duplicatory and unnecessary service rivalry. But the cure has proved worse than the disease.

Healthy service competition can be encouraged and unhealthy service rivalry can be discouraged by—

1. Abandonment of attempts—keyed primarily to costs, not effectiveness—to force service weapons systems into "all-purpose" molds. "Commonality" develops naturally from actual technological accomplishments, not from "PDP's" or paper plans.
2. Return, insofar as possible, to competition in hardware rather than competition on paper. The end product is almost certain to be better, and ultimately may cost less.
3. Sponsorship, within a service, or by two or more services, of competitive research and development projects, all having a common goal, but each following different technological paths to that goal.
4. Definite selection by the Defense Department at the earliest possible stage of the best project; cancellation of the others.

The key lessons for tomorrow are two. Responsibility and authority must be coupled at working levels in the management

* There are countless instances of this kind of adaptation. In addition to the liquid- and air-cooled engines and the F-4B, the Air Force, for instance, uses the Navy-developed Sidewinder and Bullpup missiles.

of research and development and production contracts. And there must be a much higher degree of job stability and continuity in management than the rotational policies of the services have made possible in the past.⁷

III

Mr. Rles, whose studious book on defense organization cannot be accused of service or political partisanship, quotes Ernest Dale as writing in the *American Economic Review* for May 1961: "The greatest single bane of management today is its growing absolutism, its refusal to discuss or listen to different opinions." Mr. Rles declares that "fantastic though it may seem, defense reformers have succeeded in turning the calendar back 60 years."

Whether one agrees with this strong statement or not, there can be no basic disagreement with the testimony given to the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1949 by Ferdinand Eberstadt, one of the most perceptive students of defense organization. He said: "From shattered illusions that mere passage of a unification act would produce a military utopia, there has sprung an equally illusory belief that present shortcomings will immediately disappear if only more and more authority is conferred on the Secretary of Defense, and more and more people added to his staff. . . . I suggest that great care be exercised lest the Office of Secretary of Defense, instead of being a small and efficient unit which determines the policies of the Military Establishment and controls and directs the departments, feeding on its own growth, becomes a separate empire."

Today the separate empire exists. Parkinson's law must be reversed if the Pentagon is to stop "feeding on its own growth" and if ideas, weapons development and imaginative policies are to be encouraged.

TEXTILE MILL MARGINS BIGGEST IN 19 YEARS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the supplemental appropriation last week for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, I charged that textile mills have not kept their end of the bargain under which they were to drop consumer prices to reflect the advantage they gain from multimillion-dollar payments they receive in the new cotton subsidy program.

Since then I have had communications from the industry both supporting and challenging my charge.

The very proper and valid question still remains: Have the textile mills, which have already received over \$300 million in taxpayer-financed payments under this new program, kept faith by dropping their prices?

Today I received statistical information supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which, frankly, is shocking and suggests that the textile mills have not kept faith. The information is published in Cotton Situation, CS-216, issued for release February 1.

The purpose of the cotton legislation was to make cotton more competitive so farmers could have expanding markets. Because the domestic price has been kept artificially high, in recent years the U.S. cotton industry has been losing out to manmade fibers and to cotton textile imports.

The Cotton Situation bulletin reports that cotton textile imports have trended upward in the months since the new cotton program began. Meanwhile, cotton textile exports have remained below the same months in 1963.

Exporters of U.S. textiles, so the official report states, "are finding it more difficult to sell in foreign markets because of first, rising prices for domestically produced goods, resulting in part from inventory demand; and second, the elimination of equalization payments under the cotton products export program."

The same bulletin reports "cloth prices slightly higher." It continues:

Prices paid by mills for cotton used in the 20 constructions have trended upward in recent months but not as fast as have cloth prices. As a result, mill margins have continued to widen.

The bulletin's statistics indicate further that U.S. exports of both raw and textile cotton are down.

What has happened? The statistical table published on page 17, identified as table 14, in Cotton Situation suggests the answer:

TABLE 14.—Fabric value, cotton price and mill margin, per pound, United States, by months, August 1960 to date

(In cents)

Month	Fabric value (20 constructions) ¹					Cotton price ²					Mill margin ³				
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
August	62.86	58.78	61.12	60.60	61.00	32.52	34.84	35.89	35.33	27.64	30.34	23.94	25.23	25.27	33.36
September	61.90	59.78	60.93	60.99	61.02	32.25	35.16	35.23	35.19	26.82	29.65	24.62	25.70	25.80	34.20
October	60.64	60.32	60.71	61.34	61.25	32.05	35.35	35.08	35.11	26.80	28.59	24.97	25.63	26.23	34.45
November	59.98	60.45	60.68	62.00	61.48	31.99	35.46	35.10	35.27	26.98	27.99	24.99	25.58	26.73	34.50
December	58.61	60.54	60.67	62.29	62.27	32.00	35.58	35.30	35.37	27.30	26.61	24.96	25.37	26.92	34.97
January	58.06	60.63	60.55	62.34	-----	32.01	35.78	34.45	35.47	-----	26.05	24.85	25.10	26.87	-----
February	57.78	60.76	60.47	62.40	-----	32.41	35.82	35.66	35.55	-----	25.37	24.94	24.81	26.85	-----
March	57.64	61.07	60.49	62.45	-----	33.32	35.98	35.95	35.58	-----	24.32	25.09	24.54	26.87	-----
April	57.46	61.23	60.26	62.00	-----	33.46	35.85	36.08	35.63	-----	24.00	25.38	24.18	26.37	-----
May	57.54	61.19	60.00	61.62	-----	33.86	36.13	36.16	35.67	-----	23.68	25.06	23.84	25.95	-----
June	57.60	61.24	60.11	60.87	-----	34.09	36.34	35.86	35.76	-----	23.51	24.90	24.25	25.11	-----
July	57.88	61.29	60.28	60.95	-----	34.45	36.19	35.57	35.60	-----	23.43	25.10	24.71	25.35	-----
Crop-year average ⁴	59.00	60.61	60.52	61.65	-----	32.87	35.71	35.61	35.46	-----	26.13	24.90	24.91	26.19	-----

¹ The estimated value of cloth obtainable from a pound of cotton with adjustments for salable waste.

² Monthly average prices for 4 territory growths, even running lots, prompt shipments, delivered at group 201 (group B) mill points including landing costs and brokerage. Prices are for the average quality of cotton used in each kind of cloth. Beginning August 1964, prices are for cotton after equalization payments of 6.5 cents per pound have been made.

³ Difference between cloth prices and cotton prices.

⁴ Starts Aug. 1 of the year indicated.

Source: Cotton Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

You will note that fabric value has held fairly steady throughout a 4½-year period. As of December 1964, it was 62.27 cents per pound, about the same as a year ago—62.29.

⁷ As Representative MELVIN PRICE notes, one reason, for example, that the Army (nuclear) reactor program (a program for developing a small portable nuclear reactor which could provide power in remote areas) has fallen flat on its face is that the Army kept transferring out the managers of the program. There were six different managers in 5 years.

However, the price of cotton to the mills dropped sharply during that same 1-year period, declining from 35.37 cents a pound, to 27.30 cents—a decline of more than 8 cents a pound. The mill margin—the gross profit per pound—therefore jumped from 26.92 cents to 34.97 cents—an increase of more than 8 cents.

Curiously, the increase in mill margin from the month before the new mill-subsidy program became effective—July, 25.35 cents—to the month after it became effective—August, 33.36 cents—is

8.01 cents, almost exactly the amount of reduction in the price of cotton.

Meanwhile, fabric prices started a new upward climb, instead of going down.

From this, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the multimillion payments to the mills went into net profit rather than into lower prices on finished products.

After receiving the bulletin from USDA I checked with the Department and learned that since the new subsidy program began, the cost of cotton to the mills has dropped to the lowest point

since the Korean war period 19 years ago. Likewise, mill margins are at the very highest point since the Korean war.

What of the plight of the cotton farmer? Is he better off as the result of this program? Far from it. The farmers who produce over 70 percent of the cotton are worse off, income-wise. Even the small producer, who has received a special direct payment under the program is only slightly better off income-wise. When the plight of cotton is measured from the standpoint of world and domestic markets for U.S. cotton, all cotton farmers are worse off.

Where are the champions of the cotton farmer?

This program certainly has not helped the farmer. It has not helped the consumer. Definitely it has helped the profit situation of the textile mills.

To sum up, after more than \$300 million in handouts to textile mills, consumer prices are up, U.S. exports of raw cotton and textiles are down, and mills are showing the biggest margins in 19 years.

AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROVIDE THAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOREIGN CHARITIES BE DEDUCTIBLE FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 170(c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a charitable contribution made to a foreign charity by a U.S. taxpayer to be deductible for income tax purposes.

The nondeductibility of such contributions was brought to my attention by a constituent and his wife who during the past several years have made contributions to Protestant religious groups in Japan. The constituent's father established a mission in Japan in 1895 and this mission today is known as the "Church of Christ in Japan." A college classmate of his wife built a settlement house in Japan and both of these worthwhile organizations have received financial and moral support over the years from these two Americans. These Americans are quite interested in the progress and work of these Japanese organizations and have generated a great deal of good will and friendship for our people. Deductions of gifts to these two religious charities and similar organizations have been disallowed by the Internal Revenue Service for the reason that under the present law they do not qualify for such treatment.

Section 170(c) of the 1954 code provides in part that for the purposes of this section, the term "charitable contributions" means a contribution or gift to or for the use of:

2. A corporation, trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation—

(A) created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States.

After I looked into this matter I wrote Mortimer M. Caplin, then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and he replied stating that the legislative background of section 170(c) (2) of the 1954 code indicates the intent of Congress that only contributions made to "domestic" charities be deductible. He said this restriction which was first enacted into the law as section 23(c) of the Revenue Act of 1938 limits the deduction for contributions to those made to or for the use of a domestic charity. In his letter he quoted from the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on section 23(c) of the Revenue Act of 1938, H.R. 1860, 75th Congress, 3d session—1938—pages 19 and 20, as follows, to wit:

Under the 1936 act, the deductions of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions (sec. 23(q)). The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burden which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derives no such benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization, the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionary and educational purposes) will not affect the deductibility of the gift.

The policy reasons cited for limiting the deduction to domestic organizations might have had some validity in 1938, but it sounds almost strange in 1963, particularly when we think in terms of our mutual security programs, the purposes of point 4, Peace Corps, student exchanges, and so forth. It seems to me that the time has come for the Ways and Means Committee to again consider these basic policy reasons established back in 1938 to determine whether or not they are still valid or whether or not some changes should be made to more accurately reflect our present policies and attitudes.

When I introduced this bill during the last session, I received a report from Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, giving me the Treasury's views on this bill. I include that report in the Record at this point:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D.C., December 23, 1963.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views and recommendations of this Department on H.R. 8367 (88th Cong., 1st sess.), entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income."

The bill, if enacted, would make two changes in the present provisions dealing with income tax deductions for gifts to foreign charities. The first change would be to

eliminate the present requirement contained in the last sentence of section 170(c) (2) of the Code which requires that contributions made by corporations to a "trust, chest, fund, or foundation" shall be deductible only if "the contribution is to be used within the United States or any of its possessions;" the so-called domestic use requirement. The second change would eliminate the present language contained in section 170(c) (2) (A) which requires that all deductible contributions must be made to a charitable organization "created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or Territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States;" the so-called domestic organization requirement.

ELIMINATION OF THE DOMESTIC USE REQUIREMENT

As noted above, a corporation, under present law, may only deduct a contribution to unincorporated donees if the gift is to be used exclusively within the United States or any of its possessions. However, since the code does not specifically require gifts by a corporation to a charitable corporation to be used exclusively within the United States or any of its possessions, the Service has taken the position that a gift by a corporation to a domestically organized charitable corporation is not subject to the domestic use requirement. Because of the presence of a domestic organization through which the Internal Revenue Service can monitor the activities of the donee organization so as to determine whether such activities are in accord with the congressional grant of an income tax deduction to the donor, the absence of a domestic use requirement with respect to gifts made by noncorporate donors has not led to any serious abuses or administrative problems. Therefore, we would have no objection to treating charitable contributions made by corporate donors in a manner similar to that presently accorded in the case of contributions by noncorporate donors. Accordingly, this Department would have no objection to the removal of the last sentence of section 170(c) (2) (the domestic use requirement).

ELIMINATION OF THE DOMESTIC ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENT

The second change which would be made by the bill would be to broaden the provisions allowing deductions for charitable contributions so as to permit the deduction of gifts made by both corporate and noncorporate donors without regard to whether the donee institution is a domestic or a foreign charity. Such was the scope of the law with respect to charitable contributions made by noncorporate donors prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1938. The expressed intent of the present restriction upon income tax deductions for charitable contributions to domestic charities, which was enacted in that year with respect to gifts made by noncorporate donors, was to insure that the United States would obtain an offsetting benefit for the revenue loss resulting from the deductibility of such contributions. At that time the Ways and Means Committee took the position that the United States derives no benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and that, therefore, only contributions to domestic organizations should be deductible under the income tax law. Thus, the report of the Ways and Means Committee states that: "Under the 1936 act the deduction of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions. The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of

revenue by its relief from financial burdens which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derived no such benefit from gifts from foreign institutions, and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionaries and educational purposes) will not effect the deductibility of the gift."

Irrespective of the validity at the present time of the reasoning which led Congress to limit the deduction to contributions made to domestic organizations in 1936 and 1938, the Treasury Department believes that the limitation should now be maintained for strong administrative reasons. We feel that the elimination of the domestic organization requirement, which would allow tax deductible gifts to be made directly to foreign charitable organizations without providing a domestic entity through which the Internal Revenue Service could insure that the provision of the income tax law allowing deductions for charitable organizations are followed, would prevent the effective supervision over charitable funds expended abroad. Such lack of an effective policing power to insure that the funds were in fact expended for religious, charitable, etc., purposes, that no part of the net earnings of the foreign entity inure to the benefit of any individual and that no substantial part of the recipient organization activities consisted of carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation would lead to widespread abuses in this area. Such action might, in effect, place foreign philanthropic activities, which could not be adequately policed, in a preferred position as compared with domestic activities.

In addition, the ability to make contributions directly to foreign organizations might permit payments with respect to which an income tax deduction has been granted to be used by Communist organizations and thus would circumvent the purpose of section 11 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 996; 50 U.S.C. 790) which denies an income tax deduction for contributions to domestic Communist-action or Communist-infiltrated organizations.

For the above reasons, this Department is opposed to the provisions of lines 6 through 9, inclusive, of H.R. 8367 which would, in effect, remove the domestic organization requirement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in reading through this report it appears that Secretary Surrey's primary objection for permitting deductions for charitable contributions to foreign charities is the difficulty of administer the program. I think Mr. Surrey is correct and I think he has put his finger on what appears to be the most difficult problem. It seems to me that we can put the burden of qualification upon the foreign country. It would certainly be in that country's best interest to see that its domestic charities qualify for private foreign aid. Why not by regulation determine what criteria must be satisfied before foreign charity can qualify and then have the foreign government process the applications of their domestic charities. This data could be submitted to the local embassy for check-

ing in the doubtful cases and the foreign charity would be obliged to recertify its qualifications each year or from time to time as the Commissioner feels appropriate.

It is certainly possible that some of these contributions will be diverted to other than charitable purposes, but this probably happens in our own country; and if it does, then the recipient should be disqualified. If we err, it should be on the side of the open door as opposed to the closed door. If our original premise is valid then we should be thinking in terms of ways to implement it rather than limit it.

Another collateral aspect of this problem involves the tax exemption status of foreign charities. The Commissioner has outlined the procedures for establishing this tax exempt status of foreign charities by various separate tax treaties. In fact, all organizations which enjoy a tax-exempt status must qualify under the Internal Revenue regulations and such organizations have been listed by the U.S. Treasury Department in IRS Publication No. 78. It does not seem to me to be an insuperable task to establish guide lines consistent with the policy behind the deduction.

There are a good many of us in Congress who believe that the people-to-people approach is extremely important if we are to achieve better understanding and closer friendships between our people and the peoples abroad. It is my feeling that such relationships should be encouraged rather than discouraged. We have written a great many tax incentives into our Internal Revenue Code to encourage the development of certain policies. This could well be an area where the Congress should take a long look to determine whether or not this impediment to contributions to foreign charities should be changed or eliminated. It may be time to replace the impediment by a policy of equality with other charitable gifts. I hope that my colleagues will give some thought to this suggestion and give the members of the Ways and Means Committee the benefit of their thinking on this matter.

TO EQUALIZE THE WITHHOLDING TREATMENT ON INVESTMENT INCOME EARNED WITHIN THE UNITED STATES BY NONRESIDENT ALIENS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend section 1441(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to equalize the withholding tax treatment of investment income of nonresident aliens earned from deposits in Federal- and State-chartered savings and loan associations on the one hand, and commercial banks and stock-owned savings and loan companies on the other.

Under existing law all investment income earned in the United States by nonresident aliens is subject to a withholding tax at a rate of 30 percent. The only exception to this withholding treatment is "interest on deposits with persons carrying on the banking business." Commercial banks are thus exempted. A revenue ruling in 1958—Revenue Ruling 58-34—has held that stock-owned savings and loan companies are also exempt. A 1954 revenue ruling has held that "savings accounts in Federal savings and loan associations are not deposits with persons carrying on the banking business"—Revenue Ruling 54-624, C.B. 1954-2, 16. State-chartered mutual savings and loan associations have not been exempted because their depositors are deemed to have received dividends on the operation of the association, and can exercise control over the operation of the association in the same manner as a holder of common stock in a corporation.

These interpretations have led to a competitive inequality in the banking business and make it more attractive for foreign investors to bank their money in commercial banks and stock-owned savings and loan associations. Currently the laws of 32 States provide for the chartering of only mutual savings and loan associations. Sixteen States have operating stock-owned savings and loan associations, and two States have authorized the chartering of this latter type but no charters have been issued. Thus, the Internal Revenue Code has forced an inequality in banking competition on the institutions of 32 of our States. Our tax laws should be aimed at creating competitive equality within a given industry rather than at destroying it. Indeed, this disparity in the market for foreign deposit funds, by reducing competition, is undoubtedly driving some foreign investors to deposit their money in other countries where greater competition has forced interest rates paid to depositors higher. This reduces, somewhat, the amount of capital that our banking system can pump into the economy and slows our economic growth. Further, the diminished flow of savings funds into the country has contributed to our balance-of-payments deficit. Therefore, I have introduced a measure today that will restore equal competitive conditions in the banking community, and will in the long run attract more deposits into our banking system.

TO EQUALIZE TAX TREATMENT OF CO-OPS

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to equalize the tax status of cooperative corporations with that of other incorporated businesses. The different Federal tax treatment of

these two forms of doing business has created an artificial competitive advantage for one over the other. Although there is some economic and social justification for giving preferential tax treatment to the small farm marketing or purchasing co-op which remains, by its small size truly a cooperative organization; there seems to be no justification for the preferential treatment to the mammoth cooperatives that have sprung up largely as the result of the preferential tax treatment they receive. This bill will also produce additional revenue for the Federal Government which would reduce somewhat the fiscal burden of all other taxpayers.

While the Congress recently partially reduced the preferential tax treatment of co-ops, under the present law, a cooperative still can escape taxation of the business income earned by distributing 20 percent of net earnings in cash to its patrons. Thus the cooperatives avoid most of the tax that is paid by other business corporations at rates up to 48 percent of their earnings. The cooperatives' patrons, however, are required to report as individual income 100 percent of their share in the cooperatives' earnings even though they may receive less than enough in cash to pay their tax obligation thus incurred.

As matters now stand, hardly anyone is satisfied with these provisions of the 1962 Revenue Act, which purport to tax cooperative income either to the cooperative or to its patrons. The patrons can complain that it is unjustifiable to require them to pay tax in excess of the cash they receive as part of their patronage dividends, the Treasury is deprived of the opportunity to collect the tax at the source, and businessmen are disappointed because they believe that cooperative income should be taxed in the same way as the income of any other corporation in order that there will be competitive fairness.

Cooperative leaders claim that there should be a single tax on income, and that it should be at either the cooperative level or the patron level. I agree with this in principle, provided it is equally applicable to the earnings and dividends of all corporate businesses. This would be the single tax on corporation earnings that many of us would like to see displace the present double taxation of such earnings when they are distributed. But I believe we recognize, as realists, that the elimination of this double taxation is not at present at all likely. As long as the double taxation of corporate earnings continues for the sake of fairness in competition, it should be equally applicable to the earnings of all corporate business, cooperative corporations and ordinary corporations which compete with each other.

My bill provides for the taxation of cooperative corporations and their owner-patrons in the same way as ordinary corporations and their owners are taxed. However, it would exempt from the income tax—just as the original exemption of cooperatives, many years ago, was intended to do—those small groups of farmers who may join together to assist each other in the sale of the individual

farmer's products and the purchase of supplies that the individual farmer needs. Where such cooperative activity is this type of business operation, and the individual farmer has dominion over his own transactions, it would not be subject to the income tax.

If the earnings of cooperatives were subject to tax at both the cooperative level and the patron level, as proposed, patronage dividends, like the dividends of ordinary corporations, would be excluded from the income of the recipients up to \$100—or \$200 in the case of a joint return. This is already permitted under the present law. As comparatively few members of cooperatives receive more than \$100 a year of patronage dividends, there still would be, to a large extent, a single tax on the cooperatives' earnings, but it would apply where the impact of the tax should fall, directly to the cooperatives themselves.

The original intent of Congress to exempt from the income tax small groups of farmers that act for themselves has been so magnified and extended that it has become a tax "loophole" of major proportions, causing a revenue loss to the Government of millions of dollars each year. This constitutes a subsidy to the cooperative form of doing business at the expense of all other taxpayers, and gives this form an unwarranted competitive advantage over other forms of doing business.

The tax preference that this bill would remedy, if continued, endangers continuation of the free competitive enterprise as we know it. After all there is little distinction between the operation of a cooperative organization with hundreds and even thousands of "patrons" and a corporation with hundreds and even thousands of stockholders. Both organizations are essentially run by management and the patrons and stockholders actually have little to say about the running of the organization, particularly if it is prospering and growing. The only difference is that the patrons of a cooperative vote and elect management on the basis of a per capita voting system regardless of the number of patron shares they own while the stockholders of a corporation vote by the number of shares they own. Once either of these organizations have grown to substantial size with many owners, diffuse and unorganized as they are, management runs the show and perpetuates itself. There seems to be no economic or social justification in preferring this one form of doing business, the cooperative, over the corporation.

THERE ARE TWO SIDES TO THE SELMA STORY

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, to read the stories in the newspapers

and to listen to the TV and radio commentators one would gather that there is only one side to the story of what is happening in Selma, Ala. I assure you this is not true. Either by design or through ignorance of the situation, many of the facts about Selma and the current troubles there are not being told to the public.

In order to help set the record straight and, at least, to give the people of the United States the other side of the story, I would like to include as a part of these remarks an editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser written by an able editor, Don F. Wasson.

I ask only that my colleagues take time to read Mr. Wasson's article and weigh it against the stories as being reported from Selma.

Mr. Speaker, is there any Member of this body, or any right-thinking American citizen who will say that a return to law and order is not justified? That is all we of the South are asking. Is this an unreasonable request? Please, let us have all the facts about Selma. Let us be given the truth and then, as Americans, as men of good will, as a people grounded in a deep religious heritage, certainly we can find a solution to the problems we face.

Mr. Wasson's article follows:

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, Jan. 31, 1965]

CITY WRONGED: SELMA INSCRIBES NOTE OF REASON IN HISTORY TEXT

(By Don F. Wasson)

History is an image projected upon a screen through the telescope of time, which merges people, places, and events so that the reader gets the entire picture at one time.

Fifty, 100 or 200 years from now, the events, places and people of today will be but a paragraph in the history books and for all the toil, sweat, and tears expended by the generations of our time on earth, a paragraph is about all they will rate.

In the super colossal, wide screen, livid color drama now being acted out by today's cast of characters and called civil rights the name of one place called Selma might never appear in the finished product. It might well end on the cutting room floor, because the production will be long enough as it is.

But it would seem that if historians of the future were looking for a focal point upon which to base their postmortem conclusion as to who was right and who was wrong, what exactly did happen and what did not, then Selma, Ala., can offer a case study in the entire problem of the United States versus the people.

A DETERMINATION TO OBEY LAW

In Selma, you have a people who, nurtured on traditions as old as Selma itself, have resisted change with all their hearts and souls. They are a people who are conservative in their thoughts and actions and the forcible disruption of their traditions by an all-powerful government has been a bitter pill to swallow.

But with determination, after last year's turmoil and strife, people in Selma had come to the conclusion that they would obey the law as best they could.

Mayor Joe Smitherman and Chief of Police Wilson Baker are the men who must lead the people through this difficult transition. As Baker told a civic club meeting recently:

"This administration feels that it has a responsibility to lead Selma in dignity

through the maze of legal transition resulting from the passage of the Civil Rights Act."

AN UNREASONABLE ATTITUDE

It appeared that the transition was going peacefully until early in January when Martin Luther King, spokesman for a large segment of the Negro population, decided, in all his infinite wisdom, that Selma needed to be prodded into more rapid action in racial matters. So King, the prophet from Oslo, came into Selma and agitated the multitude. Full of ideas on how to get Negroes to register to vote, he marched them upon the courthouse and here is where the unreasonable attitude of the racial agitators comes into sharp focus.

The Dallas County Board of Registrars had requested, and had received approval of the State, to register voters for 10 additional days in January. Normally the board meets twice a month, on the first and third Mondays, to accept voter applications. Records show that it can handle from 25 to 35 voter applicants at 1 day's session.

But Martin Luther King sends 150 or more down to the courthouse to register and they come back again, and again.

IN 6 DAYS, 35 APPEARED

Now any resident of Dallas County had ample reason to know that the voter registration time had been extended, but on the first 6 days the board was in session, only 35 prospective voters showed up. Of these, 20 were Negroes. These 20 Negroes received the applications without fuss, and, as far as can be determined, were registered.

So, with 4 days left, Martin Luther King herds his flock down to the courthouse. It seems that anyone with sense enough to pass the voter requirements would know that a three-man board couldn't register that many people in 4 days, even if they were all qualified.

Some of Martin Luther's flock, once inside the registrar's office, indicated that they didn't really want to be there. There also appeared several Negroes who could neither read nor write.

REGISTERING, OR AGITATING?

So it would appear that King and his cohorts in CORE, SNICK, and other racial groups weren't really so interested in registering Negroes as voters as they were in agitating.

It seems from here that historians who write of our day and time are going to be lenient of the good people of Selma, and other southern cities who tried to do right but that they will be pretty rough on King and his cohorts whose goals always appear to be self-aggrandizement and agitation—keeping their reputations alive—as it were.

Selma's mention in the history books might well read: "In one city in Alabama, Selma, in Dallas County, the white people tried to meet the demands of the times as dictated by the Federal courts with reasonableness, but it was not allowed by the racial agitators."

THE INVADING HORDE

And in passing, we might also condemn a large segment of the national press, those publications who feed on sensationalism and half-truths, for sending into Selma a horde of semilliterate newsmen who, without feeling for the hard-working and God-fearing people, send back stories which distort the facts or, worse, disregard the facts completely.

You can read in countless publications how the great and noble King was punched in the face in Selma, Ala., without ever reading that the man who punched the Negro leader was not a Selman. Was not, in fact, a native Alabamian.

You can read how a law officer subdued a Negro woman who was standing in the voter line without ever knowing that she shouted obscenities at him beforehand. You can

read how a law officer insisted that the Negroes use a certain door to enter the courthouse without ever seeing an explanation that a crowd of this size would completely block the main entrance and put a stop to normal business conducted in other courthouse offices.

BEATNIKS, UNLIMITED

Many of these so-called newsmen turn up at every scene of racial unrest. A good many of them seem to have been swept from the expresso houses and their knowledge of the history and traditions of the South is totally nonexistent. Yet they come down dressed in unpressed clothes and superior attitudes and sniff around for trouble. They see King get hit and this is all they need. The wires to New York and other centers of culture are kept hot with their unmitigated trash, their half-truths and fabrications.

We have warred with the northern and liberal press before and we shall again. But the indictment of history shall weigh far more heavily upon the heads of these publishers than it shall upon the good people of Selma.

These good people are to be commended for their forbearance under circumstances no outsider can ever fully appreciate. And we say to them, "Hold fast to reason, for it surely shall prevail in the light of history."

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE PLAN

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 and over on a uniform basis throughout the United States. The cost of the program will be shared by the individual participants and the Federal Government. The program will be entirely voluntary.

I am happy to state that joining me today in the introduction of identical bills are Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California; Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio; Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois; Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin; Hon. BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota; Hon. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama.

The plan will more adequately meet the medical needs of the aged than the administration's medicare proposal. It will be more equitable. It will not endanger the soundness of the social security system. It will be voluntary instead of compulsory.

The administration plan is generally limited to hospital and nursing home expenses. This plan will cover both hospital and nursing home care and surgical and medical expenses. It is both comprehensive in scope and comprehensive in effect. It will cover up to \$40,000 of expenses.

The administration plan is compulsory. This plan is voluntary and every citizen over 65, without a means test, will be eligible for coverage under it.

The administration plan is inequitable. It requires wage earners to pay a regres-

sive payroll tax chargeable to the lowest levels of income to provide medical benefits for others—a tax misleadingly justified on the basis that workers are prepaying for their own care. This plan will mainly be financed from two sources—the beneficiaries themselves based upon their ability to pay, and by the Federal Government through general revenues derived from taxes collected on the same principle. In addition, provision will be made for the States to share in financing full participation for the medically indigent.

The administration plan endangers the adequacy of retirement, death, and disability benefits under the social security system by pushing the regressive payroll tax to the limits of acceptability. The insurance concept of this plan, its method of financing, and its administration are completely independent of the social security system. Social security benefits are used merely as a test of ability to pay the individual contribution. The social security system's only involvement is the assignment of a specified percentage of an individual's social security benefits to a health insurance fund administered by the Secretary of the Treasury.

In summary, the administration's medicare proposal is unsound and dangerous. Its enactment would start us down a path from which there is no returning—the path toward regimented and deteriorating medical care. We propose a solution which we believe is typically American—comprehensive, fair, voluntary, and oriented to individual freedom and initiative. This is the way to meet the urgent needs of our elder citizens in the financing of medical care.

In brief outline, the plan would work as follows:

All persons aged 65 or over would be eligible, on a uniform basis, for insurance protection equivalent to the Government-wide indemnity benefit plan. Their participation would be voluntary; there would be no means test. Enrollment would be during an initial enrollment period, followed by periodic enrollment periods.

For those under social security—or railroad retirement—enrollment would be exercised by an assignment of a premium contribution to be taken out of, or checked off, the individual's current social security benefit. Those not under social security would execute an application accompanying it with their initial premium contribution. State agencies would be granted an option to purchase the insurance for their old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged recipients at a group rate.

Premium contributions by individuals would be based upon the cash benefits which they would either receive, or be entitled to receive, upon reaching age 65. The premium would be 10 percent of the minimum social security benefit and 5 percent of the balance. Those receiving the lowest social security benefits would pay the least. The average premium contribution on the basis of today's benefit levels would be \$6 per month per person. Persons not under social security would pay a premium equivalent to

the maximum contribution of an individual under social security. The remainder of the cost of the insurance would be paid by the Federal Government out of general revenues.

Benefits would be paid out of a national health insurance fund. The fund would receive as deposits the contributions of individuals, contributions from the social security system and Railroad Retirement Board on behalf of individuals covered under those systems, State contributions for OAA and MAA recipients, and annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury would administer the fund. The insurance program would be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would be charged with general administration, recordkeeping, and so forth, but would not process the claims or bills of hospitals, physicians, and the like. The Surgeon General would contract with private agencies—Blue Cross-Blue Shield, for example—which would process and pay the claims of those furnishing services and would then be reimbursed from the national health insurance fund.

DESCRIPTION OF COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH INSURANCE BILL

SUMMARY OF BENEFITS

The program will provide for comprehensive health insurance equivalent to the medical services available to Government employees under the high option of the Governmentwide indemnity plan, modified in order to meet the special needs of the aged.

The benefits under the program will greatly exceed the benefits provided for in the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1). The program provides for full coverage of the first \$1,000 of hospital—or nursing home—room and board plus 80 percent of any balance. This is the equivalent to 50 days in the hospital or 100 days of a qualified nursing home without a deductible.

In addition, the program provides for 80 percent of all other hospital, surgical, and medical expenses, after a deductible of \$50, of which only \$25 will apply to other hospital charges. This includes professional services of doctors, such as surgery, consultations, and home, office, and hospital calls, professional services of registered nurses, diagnostic services, rental of medical equipment, ambulance service, and prescribed drugs and medicines.

The program covers the catastrophic illness, with up to \$40,000 in benefits. No longer will the life savings of an elderly person be wiped out because of a major illness.

The program will pay the actual charges for the service, subject to the reasonable and customary test used by private insurers.

Except for the liberalization of the coverage of hospital room and board to include nursing homes, the program is in all respects identical to the high option of the governmentwide indemnity plan offered to Federal employees. This means that an individual can undergo major surgery and have paid in full the first \$1,000 of hospital room and board

plus 80 percent of all other hospital and medical expense incident to that operation after a deductible of not more than \$50. In addition, the program will cover 80 percent of all posthospital medical expense after the deductible of \$50 has been exceeded by prior expense, including the \$25 deductible applicable to the hospital charges.

METHOD OF FINANCING

The program would be financed by a graduated premium contribution by the individual participants based on ability to pay, supplemented by an annual appropriation from the general revenues.

By including a contribution or premium charge, the cost of the program is shared by those who receive the benefits and by the Government.

Unlike the King-Anderson bill, the program does not rely upon a regressive payroll tax for financing. The program thus avoids the dangerous fiction inherent in the King-Anderson bill that, through the use of a payroll tax, today's workers and their employers are prepaying the cost of health protection for their later years. The fact is that the regressive payroll tax will be financing the cost of medicare for those currently over 65. Under our program, the Government's share of this cost will be paid from the general funds of the Government.

ELIGIBILITY FOR COVERAGE

All persons upon attaining age 65 will be eligible for coverage on a voluntary basis. Following enactment of the program, there will be a 6-month enrollment period during which all persons 65 years of age and over will be eligible to elect to participate. Thereafter, there will be periodic enrollment periods. All persons upon reaching age 65 will have 7 months within which to elect to participate.

Under the King-Anderson bill, all persons aged 65 and over—except Federal employees—are automatically covered regardless of their wishes in the matter. This results in the inclusion of persons opposed to such coverage, for example, the Amish, Christian Scientists, as well as those already covered by group insurance programs.

The voluntary concept avoids excess coverage. Since there is a cost to the insured, those who already have adequate programs paid for by their former employers or through associations and the like, may decide not to participate in the Government-sponsored program. The automotive workers, the chemical workers, and other large industrial groups, have fully paid comprehensive health plans for retired workers. To the extent that these do not participate, the cost to the Government is reduced.

MANNER OF ELECTION

For those under social security—or railroad retirement—the election will be exercised by authorizing a "check-off" or assignment of the prescribed premium contribution out of the individual's current monthly social security benefit. An election by those not under social security—or railroad retirement—will be evidenced by execution of an application for participation in the program and the payment of premium contributions.

BASIS FOR PREMIUM CONTRIBUTIONS

The premium contributions by the participants are graduated according to ability to pay as evidenced by their old-age insurance benefit. The premium is an amount equal to 10 percent of the minimum cash benefit of a primary beneficiary—currently \$40 per month—plus 5 percent of the additional cash benefit payable to the primary beneficiary and his spouse—if over age 65. This will result in an average premium contribution of \$6 per month per person.

If an individual otherwise entitled to receive cash benefits under social security is ineligible for such benefits—or such benefits are reduced—on account of the earnings test, this will not affect the individual's contribution. The amount of the individual's contribution will be paid by the Social Security Administrator to the insurance program irrespective of earnings. To this extent, there is an automatic liberalization of the earnings test.

At the existing level of social security cash benefits, the premium contributions required for select benefit levels would be as follows:

<i>Monthly benefit of aged family unit and monthly health contribution</i>	
\$40 (single worker)-----	\$4.00
\$60 ¹ -----	5.00
\$75-----	5.75
\$105-----	7.25
\$150-----	9.50
\$190 ² -----	11.50

¹ Present monthly minimum of \$40 for worker and \$20 for wife.

² Present monthly maximum of \$127 for worker and \$63 for wife.

Railroad retirement contributions would be based upon the same formula as the social security contributions, up to the maximum payable by social security participants.

For a couple receiving the maximum social security benefit—currently \$190—the cost of the insurance will be \$11.50 per month. A couple receiving the minimum social security benefit—currently \$60—will be able to buy the same health insurance at a cost of \$5 per month. The amount of the Government subsidy thus varies with the economic status of the individual, as measured by social security benefits.

At the conference on the social security amendments bill of 1964, it was virtually agreed that OASI cash benefits should be increased by 7 percent with a minimum increase of \$5 per month. We can assume that an increase will be enacted this year at least equal in amount. This will provide the OASI beneficiaries with additional funds required to participate in the insurance program.

Persons who are not under social security may participate by a premium contribution equal in amount to the maximum contribution of those eligible under social security. Where payment of the premium would represent an undue hardship, such as in the case of a person under old-age assistance, the individual could be included under the group buy-in option extended to the States.

The insurance concept is completely independent of the social security sys-

tem. Social security benefits are used merely as a test of ability to pay in determining the amount of the individual contribution. The assignment of a predetermined percentage of these benefits to the health insurance fund is the only relationship of the program to the OASDI system.

PARTICIPATION BY STATE AGENCIES—GROUP
BUY-IN OPTION

State agencies will have the option to purchase the plan benefits for their old-age assistance—OAA—and medical assistance for the aged—MAA—recipients at a group rate equivalent to the weighted average rate applicable to the social security beneficiaries, which is presently about \$6 per month.

The program preserves fully the role of the States in providing for those who are in need. The State agency will have considerable flexibility in meeting the requirements of these groups. If the individual is a social security beneficiary, presumably the State would require the individual to elect the benefits through the assignment of social security benefits and increase the individual's old-age assistance cash allowance to make up the difference. Other recipients of State aid could be blanketed in at the group rate.

Thus, while the individual contributions will vary, all persons over 65 will be eligible for the identical comprehensive protection. No distinction is made between the person covered on an individual basis, the recipient of OAA or the recipient of MAA.

ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

There will be established a national health insurance fund. The fund will be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. Premium contributions of the individual participants will be deposited directly to the credit of the fund. An appropriation will be made annually to provide for the additional amount required by the fund in order to finance benefits for the ensuing benefit period.

The general administration of the insurance program will be entrusted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That Department will be charged with the responsibility of making known the program to those presently over age 65; notifying those reaching age 65 in the future of their rights to participate; maintaining records; preparing actuarial studies; and presenting the appropriation requests for the program to the committees of the Congress, and so forth.

The Office of the Surgeon General will be charged with the administration of the benefit provisions of the program. The Surgeon General will utilize established health insurance organizations to process the claims—bills—of the hospitals, physicians, and other organizations rendering the service. Payment for health service will be processed in the same manner as a charge presently covered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield or a private insurer. The hospital, physician, and the like will send their bills to the accredited health organization designated to process claims. After the customary verification, such organization will pay the charge. The paying organization will then be reimbursed by the

Treasury for the charges paid together with an agreed upon fee or handling charge.

Examples showing comparable benefits under King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1) and under this program

CASE A—HOSPITAL	
	Amount
Hospital room and board.....	\$441
Hospital ancillary charges.....	353
Surgeon and anesthetist.....	260
Other physicians.....	200
Private duty nurse.....	85
Out-of-hospital drugs.....	75
Other expense.....	15

Total medical expense..... 1,429
Recovery under King-Anderson bill... -754

Cost to insured under King-Anderson bill..... 675
Additional recovery under this program..... -438
Cost to insured under this program..... 237

CASE B—NONHOSPITAL	
Surgery.....	10
Nonhospital physician visits.....	120
Nonhospital nurse visits.....	8
Prescribed drugs.....	94
Other nonhospital care.....	18

Total medical expense..... 250
Recovery under King-Anderson bill... 0

Cost to insured under King-Anderson bill..... 250
Additional recovery under this program..... -160

Cost to insured under this program..... 90

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK
OF FEBRUARY 8 AND BALANCE OF
THIS WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the majority leader, if he would kindly advise us as to the legislative program for the following week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. There is no further legislative business this week. The program for the week of February 8 is as follows: Monday, a request to send to conference House Resolution 234, supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Monday is District day. There are 11 bills as follows:

H.R. 1064, authorizing canine corps for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1065, exempting majority and minority rooms from sales tax;

H.R. 1066, retirement salaries of certain retired judges;

H.R. 647, appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust;

H.R. 66, discharge of parolees from supervision;

H.R. 1699, to permit national board examinations for podiatrists;

H.R. 1700, providing for voluntary admissions to District of Columbia Training School;

H.R. 1007, exemptions from attachment of wages of nonresidents;

H.R. 947, requiring reports to police of motor vehicle collisions;

H.R. 948, amending District of Columbia Code with respect to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage; and

H.R. 3314, requiring premarital examinations.

For Tuesday and Wednesday: H.R. 3818, repealing certain legislation relating to reserves against deposits in Federal Reserve banks, and for other purposes.

For Thursday and the balance of the week there is no legislative business scheduled.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
FEBRUARY 8

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE KATHERINE ST.
GEORGE

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress, it was my pleasure to serve on the U.S. delegation to Interparliamentary Union Conferences in Lucerne, Copenhagen, and here in Washington. I was impressed time and time again by the interest and dedication and leadership of our chairman, the Honorable Katherine St. George, of New York.

Mrs. St. George gave of herself and her time unstintingly to make the participation of the United States effective and meaningful. We are all in her debt.

I think it was fitting that Mrs. St. George was elected an honorary member of the U.S. group and as secretary. I am delighted that we will have the benefit of her enthusiasm and wisdom during the 89th Congress and in the future.

A 4-YEAR TERM

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Lowell, Mass., Sun has made an interesting and thoughtful contribution to the growing dialog on congressional organization and procedure. In its January 30 edition, an editorial "A 4-Year Term," explored the possibility of a longer term for Members of the House of Representatives.

Most importantly, the editorial stressed the need for a "lively debate" on the structure and functions of Congress. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and insert it in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

A 4-YEAR TERM

For a long time Members of the U.S. House of Representatives have grumbled that because of their 2-year terms, they have to start running for reelection practically as soon as they are sworn in each term.

Political scientists have been in general agreement that 2 years is too short a term for any elective office. But, like doing something about the weather, this has been all talk and no action.

There are some historic arguments advanced by the few persons who declare their support of the present system. One is that 2-year elections "keep the House close to the people." In those days when sessions of Congress ran only 3 or 4 months and Representatives spent most of their time at home, maybe there was some validity to this.

Now, however, with 8- to 10-month sessions, most House Members maintain offices in their districts, keep in contact by telephone, and jet back home every 2 or 3 weeks. They keep in close touch with their constituencies, still, but with the addition of primaries and general elections every 2 years, they don't have much time on Capitol Hill to carry out the constituents' wishes.

There is some debate as to the desirability of entirely doing away with mid-term elections. Proponents of this idea contend that a President shouldn't be shackled by the loss of strength the "ins" usually suffer in these nonpresidential year elections. The reverse of that argument is that public sentiment may change sharply in 2 years, and that

these elections provide a check on the administration.

One compromise proposal has been advanced in the past calling for half the House Members to be elected every 2 years, for 4-year terms.

Whether this ferment results in a constitutional change or not, it's healthy to have the discussion.

Certainly Congress is covered with the barnacles of tradition. A lively debate upon its structure and functions might at least result in a few such innovations as electric voting machines, trimming much of the dreary, useless verbiage from the Appendix to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and reducing abuse of the franking privilege.

THE CHEATING SCANDALS AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern and regret of all Americans about the recent cheating scandals at the Air Force Academy. I have a unique concern as one of the two Members of this Congress who is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The Air Force Academy honor system is patterned after the honor system at West Point.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to explain in some depth some of the features of this honor system. The press has not been able, in short reports, to do this, and I am glad to have the opportunity to do this today.

The honor system at West Point is not just an honor system. It is a way of life. It involves everything that a cadet may do or think during his 4 years at West Point and during his life thereafter. It does involve, yes, cheating, but many other things. It does not just mean that a professor is free to leave the room during an examination. It means much more. It means that a cadet's word is trusted in everything he does. A cadet can explain any action of his. No one is requested to corroborate his reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of one occasion when I was a cadet at West Point when due to a blizzard, many cadets were late coming back from leave because so many of the planes and trains were not running. In no case did the academy check the word of a cadet or check to see if the trains were running, although this could have involved very severe penalties.

Mr. Speaker, when a cadet appears before a general board for a very serious infraction of the rules there are no witnesses. The cadet's word is taken as his bond. When a cadet leaves his room the room may be inspected. He may mark a card in the room saying merely that he is on an authorized visit and his word is always accepted.

I would like to say further that the cadet honor code is administered by the cadets and not by the military officers.

When a cadet comes to West Point, he is not expected to know all of the rules of the honor code, but during the period of many months as a new cadet while at the U.S. Military Academy and, of course, while as a plebe at the U.S. Air Force

Academy, this honor code, and how it affects the individual cadet, is explained by other cadets. He learns the rules, he understands the rules, and he is expected to abide by the rules.

I would like to say further that the Academies are different from other schools in this country because these are not merely universities. These are academies training leaders for our Military Establishments. We are speaking of men who will lead other fine young men of our country in combat, men who must be trusted and whose word must be trusted, certainly without qualification or question.

Mr. Speaker, one of the rules of the academy honor system is that quibbling will not be allowed. Quibbling is defined as any statement which on the surface is true but which gives a false impression. This is a violation of the honor code, just the same as outright lying. This is brought out by many military experiences and one in particular that I remember.

In World War II there was a colonel who was asked a question. The question was, "Are you moving?" Everyone knew what this question meant. The question meant "Are you crossing the line of departure?" The colonel answered "yes." His troops were moving but they were not crossing the line of departure. This was quibbling. This quibbling endangered the lives of a great many men.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, we are speaking of training leaders whose word must be trusted, because it will soon become a life and death matter in the event of leading men in combat.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak particularly about one aspect of this scandal which has been emphasized so much by the press. This is the aspect of informing on others or of turning other people in.

I am informed that none have resigned to date who were involved only in reporting on others. But let me speak of reporting on others. The Air Force Academy Code is very simple. It says, "We will not lie, cheat or steal nor tolerate among us those who do."

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that cadets are not asked to turn in people who violate rules. If a cadet sees a fellow cadet who is late to formation or sees any violation of any rule, he is not expected to turn this man in. He is only expected to ask the man to turn himself in or to turn the man in to other cadets for investigation, in cases where this man is found to be lying, cheating, or stealing. Such a man is unfit to be an officer in this country's military force.

Mr. Speaker, while this is harsh and while it is not normal in our Nation's universities today, we are not speaking of a normal university situation. We are speaking of a military situation at the Military Academy, at the Air Force Academy, and at the Naval Academy.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative to this would be intolerable. We cannot train military leaders who will accept or live with anything less than complete truth and honesty.

The honor code could not be continued without this kind of a rule.

I would like to say further that these cadets, though I have great sympathy for them, knew the rules. The rules were well understood. They were given months of intensive sessions by fellow cadets, and if they did not like the rules they had the opportunity to resign.

I applaud the blue ribbon committee that has been appointed. I think an investigation of a scandal of this kind is necessary, and I am sure that the distinguished gentlemen on this committee will investigate fully. I hope that each cadet and the family of each cadet will be treated with great sympathy and understanding. Yet it is my urgent plea that the honor system of the service academies will not be attacked but, rather, that the system will be preserved and perfected. This, Mr. Speaker, is my request.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would like to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for his very fine statement on the most unfortunate situation at the Air Force Academy. Certainly the gentleman's knowledge as a graduate of West Point and as one who has maintained a continuing interest in our service academies has enabled him to shed light on this very difficult problem. The gentleman's thoughtful remarks today should do a great deal toward increasing public understanding of the regrettable problems at the Academy. I congratulate my very able colleague for the significant contribution he has made.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for clarifying what I think is an extremely difficult and unusual case. Perhaps inadvertently the American press has given some people the impression that the honor system must be at fault in this regard. I congratulate the gentleman, and I join him in his wish to clarify this point. Certainly the honor system has been more than worthwhile in the preservation of our system of values in the military academies.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort. We must make clear that the honor system itself is not subject to criticism.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, if there is any party line that is stronger than that observed in this House it is that observed between those who went to the Military Academy and those who went to the Naval Academy. I congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. I do this as a graduate of the Naval Academy, and as a graduate of the University of Virginia. I applaud the committee that has been named to investigate the tragic

scandal within the Air Force Academy. I am particularly confident something good will come of it, because it has on it Dean Hardy Dillard of the Law School of the University of Virginia.

I would add my voice and say that no matter what comes of this we need the honor system in the name of national security.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

There are three Naval Academy graduates in the Congress. The graduates of the Naval Academy share with the graduates of the Military Academy their concern at this particular time.

FEIGHAN EXPOSES MYTHICAL QUOTA SYSTEM—THREAT OF NONQUOTA IMMIGRATION DEMANDS CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to address the 36th annual conference of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies. That organization has established a meritorious record over many years in fighting for those ideals which have made our country great. The pursuit of patriotism imposes heavy responsibilities and very often brings small reward for the effort made. But this is not new. It is to the credit of all those associated with this organization that they do not seek acclaim for their efforts because their reward comes from the knowledge that they are doing what they believe to be right and necessary in any given circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, by leave granted, I insert in the RECORD the address I delivered today.

ADDRESS BY MR. FEIGHAN

Reasonable people will agree that our immigration laws are the most complex on the statute books. The complexities of the law have led to a great deal of public confusion and misunderstandings about our immigration policy—both as to theory and as to actual practice.

My remarks today will be directed to some of the realities of our immigration policy. I have singled out the major issues which should guide the current public discussion on our Nation's immigration policy. If a consensus can be found on these major issues, we stand an excellent chance of revising our immigration laws in a manner which will accord with our requirements as a nation, both domestically and internationally, at this advanced stage of our national development.

The first issue to be examined is the national origins quota system, authorized by Congress in its present form in 1924. That system assigned an annual quota to all countries outside the Western Hemisphere, based upon a mathematical proportion of people from each of those countries residing in the United States according to the 1920 census. The quota fixed for each country was expected to serve as a ceiling on immigration from each country. No quotas were fixed for independent nations within the Western Hemisphere which were thereby favored with unrestricted immigration to the United States.

The motives behind this system of an annual quota for some countries and unre-

stricted immigration from others are now open to sharp criticism and lost in an emotional upheaval. But the span of 40 years since this system was instituted permits some valid conclusions. It is now clear that the far-reaching political and economic upsets in Europe in the wake of World War I, when the geography of old empires was dissolved, posed the imminent problem of immigrant arrivals from those troubled lands on a scale which could threaten the stability of our Nation at a perilous point in history. Uninformed hindsight can easily reject this conclusion of history, but justice to those who were then responsible for the destiny of our Nation requires that we weigh that conclusion against the time and tide of human events in which it was made. Further, the harsh disappointments which followed in the wake of that war with respect to a lasting peace based upon freedom for all nations and people—our war objectives—led to disillusionment and a retreat into hemispheric isolation.

Let us not forget in terms of time, that the great expanses of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans then provided us and the other nations of our Hemisphere with a high degree of national security and regional peace which has been washed away by the relentless scientific and technological progress of the past 25 years. The New York Times, in an editorial of March 1, 1924, advanced arguments in support of the quota system based upon our right to decide who shall or shall not enter, what was best for our Nation's interest as a whole rather than the special interests of any particular groups and cautioned: "The great test is assimilability." The world of our times is a far cry from the early 1920's when the quota and nonquota concepts were laid down as basic policy for our immigration program. The New York Times, like most metropolitan newspapers, has since reversed its position of 1924.

What does the record of performance over the past 10 years, as distinguished from theory, tell us about the national origins quota system? Has it worked out in practice as the theory intended? Let us look at the official record.

Take the countries of Europe as a starter. Here are some startling comparisons:

Portugal has an annual quota ceiling of 438 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Portugal has run 2,736 per year during the past 10 years. There is a difference between the theoretical ceiling of 438 per year and the actual of 2,736 immigrant admissions each year.

Greece has an annual quota ceiling of 308 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Greece has run 2,666 per year for the past 10 years. There is a considerable difference between the theory of 308 and the actual of 2,666 per year immigrant admissions.

Italy has an annual quota ceiling of 5,666 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Italy has run 15,685 per year for the past 10 years. There is a noticeable difference between the theory of 5,666 and the actual of 15,685 immigrant visas per year.

Spain has an annual quota ceiling of 250 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Spain has run 1,264 per year for the past 10 years. The difference between the theoretical ceiling of 250 and the actual of 1,264 immigrant admissions per year is evident.

This essentially is the pattern of immigration from Europe for the past 10 years, with the exception of the once free nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain where freedom of movement is restricted and normal immigration is impossible. To summarize, of the 35 quota countries of Europe, 22 exceeded the ceiling set by the national origins quota system during the past 10 years.

Let us turn to Asia. What does the record of performance over the past 10 years tell us, as distinguished from the theory of the national origins quota system. Here are some outstanding examples.

Japan has an annual quota ceiling of 185 fixed by law. But the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of Japan has run 4,887 per year for the past 10 years.

China has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Yet the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of China has run 2,103 per year for the past 10 years. In addition, another quota concept of "Chinese persons" has been created with an annual quota of 105. Here again the record shows a total of 5,526 immigrant visas were issued to persons in this category during the past 10 years. Over and above these totals are the Chinese refugees, from Hong Kong, who are "paroled" into the United States under a Presidential determination and who are not charged to any quota system.

Indonesia has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Nevertheless there have been issued to residents of Indonesia an average of 1,657 immigrant visas each year for the past 10 years.

Philippines has an annual quota ceiling of 100 fixed by law. Here we find that the average of immigrant visas issued to natives of the Philippines has been 2,281 per year for the past 10 years.

Korea also has an annual quota ceiling of 100, fixed by law. But the record reveals an average of 1,250 immigrant visas have been issued each year for the past 10 years to natives of Korea.

To summarize, there are 34 quota countries or areas of Asia and 15 of these exceeded the theoretical ceiling set by law over the past 10 years. This record of practice provides ample evidence that the national origins quota system has not worked out as originally intended.

On a worldwide basis there are 119 quota countries or areas established by the national origins system. Of this number 46 exceeded the theoretical ceiling set by law during the past 10 years.

For the source of this wide disparity between the ceiling of immigrant admissions set by the national origins system and the actual numbers of immigrant visas issued we must look to the nonquota provisions of the law. Changing times and the pressure of meeting practical human problems in the post World War II era have resulted in a long series of amendments to the basic law authorizing nonquota status for certain classes of aliens outside the Western Hemisphere. It is these new, nonquota classes which reduce the national origins quota system to a myth.

I referred earlier to the system of unrestricted immigration from the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere as the historical companion of the national origins quota system. In the 1920's immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere was low and mobility of movement within the hemisphere was limited. But that condition has changed. Over the past 10 years an average of 110,435 nonquota immigrant visas were issued to natives of this hemisphere each year. That figure would be much higher were it not for the requirement that applicants for admission must provide proof against the likelihood of becoming a public charge.

The full scope of nonquota immigration to the United States on a global basis can be measured by the trend over the past 10 years. During that period 1,774,367 nonquota immigrant visas were issued as against 948,334 quota visas. This means approximately a 2-to-1 ratio over quota immigration.

The January 1950 issue of the Monthly Review published by the Immigration and Naturalization Service reporting on non-quota trends pointed out, "In the quarter of a century of immigration since the passage

of the Immigration Act of 1924, nonquota immigration nearly equaled quota immigration." Hence, within 15 years nonquota immigration has doubled quota immigration.

It is reasonable to conclude, based upon this examination of the record, that the national origins quota system is little more than a theory in terms of regulating immigration to the United States. If that system was intended to restrict immigration to the United States it has failed equally. It is futile to support myths, and corruptive of our national purposes to hold tightly to theories, which have little practical application.

The national origins quota system must be replaced by a new system—a selective immigration system which establishes qualitative and quantitative controls. That is the real task confronting Congress today.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his immigration message to Congress on January 13, 1965, stated: "The principal reform called for is the elimination of the national origins quota system." Later, in that message, he emphasized, "The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from, but what are his personal qualities." From these guidelines principles, upon which a new policy of immigrant admissions is to be based, a number of logical and practical questions arise.

First and foremost is the question whether people who are natives of the independent nations of the Western Hemisphere are to be considered superior to, and therefore preferable to, people born in Europe or elsewhere in the world. That is precisely what retention of the nonquota status for natives of countries of the Western Hemisphere, under provisions of the basic 1924 law would clearly imply. If we eliminate the theoretical quota system for countries outside the Western Hemisphere, which system has been labeled with being racial and prejudicial, how can we continue to justify the nonquota status for natives of independent countries in the Western Hemisphere?

The question then arises, What system shall replace the quota-nonquota concepts in the law? I favor a complete disengagement from the misleading term of quota. A numerical limit to immigrant admissions per annum on a worldwide basis is now required. The annual limit should be based upon a realistic assessment of the number of immigrants we can absorb. Our experience with immigrant admissions over the past 10 years should provide a reliable basis on which to make the assessment. The modest annual increase of 7,000 called for by President Johnson should present no real problem.

The current hassle over the national origins system has misled most people to believe that the quota of 158,361 is the maximum number of immigrants to be admitted each year. The facts are that quota immigration has been averaging 95,000 per year and nonquota immigration has been averaging 178,000 per year. That makes a grand total of approximately 273,000 rather than the misleading figure of 158,361.

It has been said that the administration bill would increase by less than 7,000 the present authorized quota. That is true. However, since an average of 63,000 of those authorized quota numbers have not been used each year and the administration bill requires that they all be used under a new system, that would mean an actual annual increase of 70,000 quota immigrants each year. Other provisions of the administration bill would result in a further increase in nonquota immigration and parole admissions. There is some doubt about the exact numbers involved. Mr. Abba Schwartz, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, in the course of testimony taken on August 3, 1964, admitted the overall admissions would increase to a minimum of 400,000. See page 533, part II, Immigration Hearings of 1964.

This would mean an increase of more than 100,000 per year over the annual average of the past 10 years. Mr. Schwartz was one of the principal architects of the administration bill and he should know something about the numbers involved.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in his testimony of last year on the international implications of our immigration policy, stated that foreign ministers complain to him about the discriminatory nature of the national origins quota system which creates problems in terms of relations with the United States. Secretary Rusk made it clear the problem was not numbers of immigrants we admit, since we have the most generous immigration program in the world, but the manner in which immigrants outside the Western Hemisphere are judged on the basis of their national origin.

Similarly former Attorney General ROBERT KENNEDY testified that he was more concerned about the method of allocating quota numbers based upon national origin than he was concerned with numbers of immigrants we admit each year. Given a choice, he hoped we would not have to reduce general immigration, but held the most important thing was to remove the penalty in the law which relates to national origin.

In light of the testimony by members of the Cabinet and the latest admonition from the President, underscoring the principal reform called for is elimination of the national origins quota system, it is fair to ask why we must at the same time increase our general immigration admissions by more than 25 percent per year? The answer to that question was not found during the 1964 congressional hearings.

The justification for this large increase if there is any must be established during the hearings which will open in the House on February 16. We will also seek clarification of the practical effect resulting from the changes made in the first administration bill, particularly the added definition of a refugee in the context of the unusual geographical definition of the Middle East to include all of north Africa. The new parole authority requested is certain to increase further the actual number of immigrant admissions each year, even though this method escapes both the quota and nonquota controls in the proposed administration bill. Further, we will need to know whether the new administration bill sent to Congress will result in an additional increase of 50,000 so-called quota immigrants beyond the 400,000 estimate, during the first year of proposed operations. If authorized but unused quota numbers from the previous year are recaptured for use in the first year of proposed operations under the new law, this added increase would be certain. The language of the proposed bill is unclear on this point and will need to be clarified.

The next major issue on which practical insight is an imperative is the problem of distributing immigrant visas on an equitable basis. Here the administration proposal calls for a seven-member immigration board, engaging four Members of Congress in the business of the executive department, with purely advisory functions on how the quota immigrant visas are to be distributed. The drafters of the bill appear to have overlooked the constitutional principle of separate but equal divisions of the Federal Government and how maintaining the balance of powers is dependent upon maintaining the separate status for each of the three branches of Government. If our Constitution provided for a parliamentary system like that of Great Britain, under which the principal officers of the Government must be Members of the House of Commons, then the mixed member immigration board called for would make sense. But our Constitution does not permit

the parliamentary system which governs Great Britain.

From a practical point of view, the unique Presidential authority over immigrant admissions called for by the administration bill could hardly be exercised by the President in the detailed manner necessary to satisfy all the facets of the problem. He is altogether too preoccupied with more important obligations. This authority would, therefore, be passed on to appointed officers of the Government, most likely the faceless bureaucracy—over whom the Congress and the people have little or no control. Anyone with experience in seeking a redress of grievances from the typical Government bureaucrat can not help but shudder at the prospect of what could happen if control of immigrant admissions was passed to them. The citizen right of petition is anchored most firmly in the Congress and our experiences over the past 20 years indicates immigration has been a matter of frequent petition for a redress of grievances. This trend is unlikely to change under the best of circumstances and Congress must retain the responsibilities involved.

We must find a new system which avoids conflict over authority and which rests upon the governing directives of clear-cut law.

One method to that end is to establish new criteria of preferences and to assign each preference a percentage ceiling of the maximum visas authorized by law for use on a worldwide basis. Limits would need to be fixed on the number of visas that could be issued annually to natives of any one country in order to guarantee fair and equal treatment to all countries.

Now, as to the preferences which would govern visa issuances within the maximum number set by law, I would urge the following preferences in this order of importance:

1. Uniting families of U.S. citizens and permanent resident aliens. Families should include those relatives covered by the present law.

The highest values of our free society are the integrity of the family and the sanctity of the home. The strength and stability of our Nation flows from a firm adherence to these values. Families, split and divided by peculiarities of law rather than free choice, are at variance with our longstanding tradition. Our first obligation should be to correct this inequity of law and to prevent its recurrence.

2. Skills, talents, and special training of applicants for an immigration visa for which there is a demonstrated need in the United States. The method now used for establishing our national needs in this regard is both inadequate and uncertain. The fault for this condition does not rest with the Secretary of Labor. Secretary Wirtz testified during the 1964 hearings that his Department had made efforts to secure authority and funds to undertake and maintain a national survey of such needs but without success. A preliminary study of the problem is now underway, however, and the results may be helpful in establishing new guidelines in law.

President Johnson proposed a new class of workers with lesser skills in his recent immigration message. The meaning and scope of this new class of preferred workers will require examination in the forthcoming hearings in the House.

The present law with respect to skilled workers requires that they be needed urgently in the United States. On this point the administration bill substitutes the requirement of "especially advantageous to" the United States. What this change of language means in terms of qualitative and quantitative application also requires clarification.

3. Haven for victims of religious and political persecution and national catastrophes. These classes of aliens have by long tradition been the beneficiaries of our humanitarian concern for the oppressed and most unfortun-

nate. For this preference a ceiling should be set and eligibility requirements governed by a statutory definition of refugee-escapee.

The administration bill as I indicated earlier recommends a different method. It requests authority to use the parole provisions of law for refugees, with no numerical limitation set as to the number of immigrants in this category to be admitted annually.

In closing I raise several questions which are basic to the principles which I have advanced for a new, selective immigration program.

If the national origins quota system is so discriminatory and offensive to our national heritage—why must we take 5 years to abolish it? Why not abolish it forthwith.

Since the national origins quota system is in fact a myth, as I have demonstrated, why should we fear to abandon a myth which has caused dissension at home and embarrassment abroad?

Let us turn our undivided attention to the real task of finding a national consensus on a selective immigration program which meets the needs of our Nation as they in fact exist today.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, once again Congress is being asked to approve large outlays for assorted Federal aid to education projects. While it is virtually impossible to estimate the total amount of cash already being expended for school-connected projects, it is reckoned that some \$8.5 billion is being expended by the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other agencies for this purpose.

Yet even this vast sum is not enough for the administration, which at latest report hopes to bring pre-kindergarten tots into the Government's chautauqua tent for exposure to the teachings and tales of erudite bureaucratic marms and masters. Rather than promise the taxpayer that he will be allowed to keep a greater share of his earnings so that he can use it to improve educational opportunities for his own children and his community, the administration would keep more and more tax revenue in order that it can dole out our funds as it sees fit to "Donald Duck" nurseries through college campuses.

The Washington Post of Sunday, January 24, described activities for 4- and 5-year-olds in one school sponsored under a grant by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity. The class has been set up for 2 hours on Saturday mornings. Here is one paragraph from the Post:

They danced in a circle (developing social capacity), sang and played a clapping game (acquiring a sense of music and rhythm), played with a set of large plastic keys (learning the colors), visited a make-believe grocery store and examined artificial fruit (sharpening imagination and the sense of touch), marched in military fashion to the washroom, and later met Cuddles, a brown guinea pig.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how my colleagues take to this sort of activity underwritten by the American taxpayer, but I personally find it entirely

repugnant and a matter that should be investigated by the appropriate committee of Congress. By whose authority does the Federal Government provide Treasury funds to teach tiny youngsters social capacity and a sense of music and rhythm? Parents who want to teach colors to their children can get a good start by having them compare the black and red figures in the national budgets of the past few years, and they can take their youngsters to supermarkets to examine the fresh fruit whose cost is completely out of proportion due largely to the inflation caused by just such ridiculous programs as this dilly sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Marching in military fashion to the washroom is no doubt meant to prepare individuals for goosestepping to the cleaners when they become taxpayers. While it is no longer possible to go to market to see a fat guinea pig, the children can learn at least a trifle more about animals at the local zoo, which is maintained by the Federal Government at great cost and is open to all without an admission fee.

This prekindergarten demonstration should serve as a warning against permitting the Federal Government's getting its dancing slipper into the door of our primary and high schools. In the early grades children may be able to further their artistry by combining the development of social capacity and music and rhythm into a single operation with simultaneous dancing and clapping to the tune of supercalifragilisticexpialidocious. Thus there will be no danger of their becoming wallflowers by the time they are ready for the Government-sponsored junior cotillion and senior prom.

Now we are all prepared for the college campus, where large plastic Phi Beta Kappa keys of various colors will await the better students with outstanding social capacity and superb sense of music and rhythm. Some time ago I received a letter protesting Federal aid to education from a member of a school board in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District. He wrote:

Do not be stampeded into passing legislation which will gradually develop into an octopus which will have its tentacles into every hamlet in the United States of America. Government power corrupts and destroys the intrinsic worth of our citizens regardless of the good intentions which created it.

Observing that free scholarships will not necessarily "make scientists," he stated:

If an individual wants to become a scientist, and is willing to pay the price, there are all the necessary opportunities in our educational system. This is just another political plum which the professional politicians and Government bureaucrats will keep dangling before the eyes of a gullible electorate.

Perhaps it is time that Congress allow itself a spoonful of this homely philosophy. Through Treasury dollars already made available in the past few years for educational purposes, the Federal Government wields its professional ruler over many of the Nation's institutions of higher learning. To extend its largesse and gratuities into areas it now

envisions will enable bureaucrats to hold the rod over a predominant number of the country's total school enrollment.

Certainly there are, at least for the time being, ample scholarships available for those who wish to become scientists or to pursue whatever career they choose. Under the National Defense Education Act a student may borrow up to \$1,000 a year for each of 4 or 5 years. He pays no interest until a year after he graduates and then pays only 3 percent. He has a 10-year period to repay, and payments are far less than on a new car. In addition, there are almost countless scholarships available through private industry, foundations, State grants, individual grants, and through numerous Federal departments and offices.

While no one qualified for college work should be deprived of the opportunity to attend an institution of higher learning if he has the interest, the ambition, and the determination, we should never forget the truism, "free scholarships do not necessarily make scientists."

Last week—January 27—was an important anniversary. It was on that date in 1880 that Thomas Edison was granted a patent for an electric incandescent lamp. Edison got no free scholarships. At 12 he was a railroad newsboy and after 15 earned his living as a telegraph operator in various cities, always studying and experimenting in his spare time. In succeeding years his inventions included—in addition to those dealing with the generation and distribution of electric light, heat, and power—stock tickers, automatic telegraph systems, the electric pen—which developed into the mimeograph—the phonograph, a machine for office dictation, and a camera for taking motion pictures.

Whether the remarkable Thomas Edison could have contributed more to mankind had he received a full education is a question open to debate, but the fact that he was not spoon-fed through his early youth by a paternalistic government certainly did nothing to discourage his driving ambition and irrepressible imagination. Energy of this nature can very well be destroyed if the task of going to college is reduced to the point where a qualified student need only apply for a Federal grant to assure a comfortable life on campus. There is also a tendency to restrict parental initiative and responsibility in the matter of a child's education through patronizing and overgenerous government proffers. At this point in the RECORD I should like to insert a news story, originating in the U.S. Office of Education, published in the *Connellsville, Pa., Courier* of April 10, 1963:

LACK OF ENCOURAGEMENT KEEPS MANY BOYS, GIRLS FROM ENTERING COLLEGES

Why is it that many bright boys and girls do not go to college? Is it because they lack the funds—or, as a recent study suggests, is it because they lack the incentive?

According to U.S. Office of Education studies, two-thirds of the country's high school graduates do not go to college, although many are obviously capable of college work, having been in the upper half of their graduating classes. While it is true that some of them miss out on a higher education because they cannot afford it, the

studies suggest that, more often, young people do not go to college because they have not been encouraged to do so.

For instance, the attitude of parents on the subject of college has a direct connection with a youngster's decision. Children of college graduates are most apt to be brought up with the idea that they, too, will go to college. But the survey does show that the child who is really hungry for college has a good chance of getting there, even though his parents may not be college-trained. The overriding factor is usually the encouragement of his parents. On the other hand, a negative attitude toward college—or even one of indifference—will have a negative effect on the youngster.

Then, too, as many parents know, teenagers' opinions can be heavily influenced by what their friends and schoolmates think about college. If the teenager happens to "travel" with a college-minded crowd, chances are he will also want to attend.

The very community in which the family lives can also affect a youngster's attitude toward school. For instance, young people who live near a college are more likely to attend than those who live some distance away. But this is not to say that families must move to the vicinity of a university to get young people interested in higher education. Parents can use their influence, wherever they live, to achieve the same end.

Perhaps some parents are reluctant to encourage the idea of a college because of the cost involved. The U.S. Office of Education reports that the national average expense for 1 recent academic year is \$1,550. Parents provide about \$950 of this amount, on the average. The balance comes from student earnings, scholarships and other sources, such as gifts.

But the young man or woman determined to enter college without a scholarship or financial aid from his family still has other avenues open to him. He can look into municipal or State colleges where fees are low; he can supplement tuition fees with a part-time job; or he may be able to obtain a student loan from a college, bank, or the Government. Substantial amounts of money have been provided for loans to college students by the Federal Government under title II of the National Defense Act of 1958. And some banks, in recent years, have established the practice of making available to promising students low-interest loans.

Actually, reports the Institute of Life Insurance, many families begin planning for their children's education in advance, particularly through systematic savings. According to a Ford Foundation study, life insurance most often figures in these plans. For example, a father buys an additional life insurance policy, earmarking the benefits for college expenses if he were to die before his youngster reaches college. If the father lives, as he probably will, the policy is valuable in other ways. He may use the cash value to help see his child through school, or he may prefer to keep the policy and borrow on it if he finds that he cannot manage comfortably out of current family income.

Incidentally, parents appear to be more willing to assist their sons than their daughters through school. This is reflected in the ratio of 13 boys for every 10 girls in college. Girls who have been through college have no doubt about the value of a college education. Not long ago, a large group of women, recent college graduates, were asked what they thought about higher education. Although many had become full-time homemakers, the group as a whole said they would follow the same course if they had to do it all over. They did not feel they had been "overeducated," and, for that matter, the majority were working in jobs which required the kind of knowledge and skills learned in college. Their education, as many

women know, is also valuable when a college graduate becomes a wife and mother.

Mr. Speaker, while these considerations are vital factors in the Federal-aid-to-education issue, the additional matter of Government waste and Government control haunts every home as well as every institution of learning in the United States. Each expenditure undertaken in Washington adds to, or precludes reduction of, the national debt, that ruthless manipulator largely responsible for the deflated value of today's dollar. While it is true that some of our communities are incapable of meeting necessary school expenses, there is hardly a place in the entire country whose financial status is on as low a level as that of the Federal Government, with a debt now far in excess of \$300 billion.

Federal aid envisioned by the administration has the added nefarious disadvantage of dissuading local effort toward improving school systems and providing more remunerative teachers' salaries. It furthermore penalizes the many States and communities which have already built new schoolhouses and raised faculty pay.

Even more repelling to understanding Americans is the portent of Federal control over our school systems whether it be at the kindergarten stage, in grade or high school, or in college—or at all levels. Delivering direction of these responsibilities to Washington would surrender to the bureaucracy the prescribing of curriculums and subject matter as well as complete supervision of faculty members.

One noted educator, Dr. Benjamin Fine, has said that the increasing number of research grants—from such agencies as the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Mental Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the U.S. Office of Education—"tumble upon the colleges in high confusion."

Each of the agencies makes its own rules and regulations and has its own standards in dealing with the colleges. Research may be contracted by one agency, supported by a grant from another, and paid for under a variety of arrangements. Dr. Fine noted also that some men are hired by colleges not because they can teach, but because they can bring a Federal research grant with them. Men are even brought in to become deans and administrators because of these grants. Dr. Fine might also have mentioned that entirely too many teachers and scientists are gravitating into administrative positions in the Federal Government because of salaries and pension plans with which local schools and universities cannot compete. This imbalance lowers the number of instructors available for actual teaching assignments and establishes unrealistic income levels for teachers-become-politicians.

Arthur Krock, *New York Times* columnist, has written:

It is a matter of record that the nationalized public school systems in other countries have been successfully employed by the dominant political party to influence the thinking of pupils through teachers who look to the capital for promotion and pay.

Mr. Krock was referring to Russia and Nazi Germany, but they are not the only

examples of the evils that come through centralized control of a nation's educational process. The threat to private as well as public schools has been explained editorially in the Steubenville, Ohio, Register, official publication of that diocese:

DANGERS OF FEDERAL AID
(By Msgr. Joseph P. Klefer)

At the turn of the century in France, the cause of Catholic education seemed doomed to extinction. Powerful forces of secularism, spurred on by rationalistic and Masonic influences, succeeded in securing legislation intended to destroy Catholic schools.

At that time, an avowed foe of the Catholic Church, Rene Viviani, speaking in the Chamber of Deputies, uttered this prediction: "We have put out lights in heaven which will never be lighted again."

The lights which Viviani and his accomplices thought had been forever extinguished in France have slowly been relit. The new French law granting aid to some 10,000 Catholic schools has provided the torch.

Under the present legislation, state payments for teachers' salaries are provided when teachers of private schools fulfill the same requirements as those in the public schools. Furthermore, local governments may pay operating expenses of such private schools.

There is a hitch to this generosity on the part of the Government. State officials reserve the right to veto the appointments of teachers and exercise limited control over the curriculum and the administration of school finances. On the secondary level, more aid to Catholic schools is provided, but, at the same time, more state control is exerted.

France joins the majority of nations in Western Europe which grant state aid for religious schools. In this respect, the United States is far behind its allies.

At the same time, we must be made aware of the dangers inherent in any Federal aid to parochial schools. France is a striking example. We must proceed with extreme caution, asking ourselves: Are we willing to risk our autonomy, our privilege of retaining religion as a vital part of our Catholic school curriculum in return for Federal assistance which may lighten our financial burden?

This, in our opinion, is a serious consideration that should be debated before we go all out in shouting for unqualified Federal aid to our Catholic schools.

Mr. Speaker, the sensible, the simple way to make more funds available for all schools—public or private, primary, high school, or college—is through legislation which I introduced on January 4, 1965, to allow a taxpayer increased personal exemptions for his children while they are attending school. The amount is graduated from the grade and high school to the college levels, but I am not wedded to the amounts of deductions provided in H.R. 1160. The size of the deductions may be amended without objection from me once the theory is thoroughly discussed in committee hearings and on the floors of the House and Senate. What is important is that Congress undertake as soon as possible to study closely this bill before the Federal Government encroaches further onto the rights of States and communities through extension of its gift, grant, endowment, and other sugar-coated educational plans that inflate inflation and thereby make school construction far more costly while robbing teachers and retired teachers of purchasing power.

RUTLAND HEIGHTS VA HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Rutland Heights in my district is one of the most shocking, indefensible measures ever undertaken by the Federal Government in the long history of the veterans rehabilitation program.

The ill-advised order closing this outstanding facility, which for 40 years has hospitalized, treated, and in many instances cured, literally thousands of disabled veterans, came like a bolt from the blue. It came without proper notice to the patients and their dear ones, the many capable faithful employees, and without proper notice or warning to the several committees of this Congress legally charged with responsibility for the care and treatment of our beloved veterans, the most cherished wards of the Government.

Upon receiving word about the Rutland Heights closing, I registered my strong protest with the President. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the text of my telegram to the President, urging retention of Rutland Heights:

JANUARY 13, 1965.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I was greatly shocked today to learn of the proposed closing of the Rutland Heights VA hospital in my district. This facility is the only veterans hospital in central Massachusetts. If it is closed it will require the veterans in my district and several other adjoining districts to be taken comparatively long distances to other VA hospitals for urgent or necessary care and treatment. Since this facility is considered by our people here in Massachusetts to be a permanent institution for the hospitalization and care of many of our veterans, its closing will be widely and bitterly protested I am sure, not only by veterans but by the general public of every race, class, and creed. I would greatly appreciate it if you would request a very careful review of this matter to permit an evaluation of all the factors that favor the continued operation of this great facility. It would be most unfortunate if we were to make our veterans the innocent victims of so-called economy which would appear to be very doubtful. I would especially appreciate your advice and assistance in this matter so that extended inquiry can be made to ascertain the wisdom and validity of this proposed closing.

Thanks and regards.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Mr. Speaker, when the closing order came on January 13, there were 396 patients in the Rutland Heights Veterans' Administration hospital and an additional 250 discharged patients still receiving careful, outpatient followup.

The announcement came at a time when the hospital was preparing to implement the new 120-bed nursing home

care unit previously authorized by the Veterans' Administration to be established at Rutland Heights.

Adequate quarters had already been selected to house this new nursing home care unit in the fine, solid building built in 1946—a well-constructed, well-laid-out, modern building that had been for some time past housing 149 patients in one and two bedrooms.

These 120 nursing home care beds were the New England regional allotment of the 4,000 nursing home care beds for veterans recently funded by the Congress.

The medical staff at the hospital had been engaged for several months in reducing the patient load in order to convert these fine accommodations into an up-to-date, completely modern, well-equipped and well-staffed, nursing home care unit.

Mr. Speaker, with the closing of Rutland Heights, the Veterans' Administration is sacrificing 120 nursing home care beds, specifically set up for the chronically ill veteran patient under legislation passed in the last Congress.

These are the beds which the Veterans' Administration was setting up for the special needs of the whole northeast area and particularly the veterans from New England. And what do we find as a sorry substitute for the phased-out Rutland beds? Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to learn that out of the first 1,000 nursing home care beds the Veterans' Administration has already allocated, there is not one single bed in New England. In fact, the Veterans' Administration hospital at Buffalo with an allocation of 36 beds is the nearest Veterans' Administration facility thus far with nursing home care beds. Apparently it is expected to be able to carry on the load that was originally intended for Rutland Heights.

It is clearly evident that the computers spilling out statistics about veteran populations and hospital operating costs were not geared to the computers allocating nursing home care beds to meet the needs of the more than 3½ million veterans in the New England States and New York. In fact, Massachusetts alone with its 700,000 veterans would sorely tax the most inadequate 36-bed allocation for Buffalo.

Prior to the Veterans' Administration order calling for the closing of Rutland Heights, I had some correspondence with the former Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, John S. Gleason, Jr. His December 31 letter touches upon our Massachusetts situation and I include it at this point in the Record:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE
OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VET-
ERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., December 31, 1964.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: Thank you for writing to me concerning the need for facilities to care for chronically ill veterans in the State of Massachusetts. Providing for such care is a recognized problem, and the Veterans' Administration now provides treatment for a wide range of chronic conditions in existing facilities.

The Veterans' Administration furnishes hospital care for non-service-connected conditions within the limits of existing facilities. As you know, most of our hospitals serve veterans in more than one State. However, the most recent census shows that there are approximately 1,600 Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical beds for an estimated 674,000 veteran population residing within the State of Massachusetts. This provides about 2.4 beds per 1,000 veterans which compares favorably with a nationwide average of about 2.7 beds per 1,000 veteran population. In addition to beds located within the State, our nearby hospitals in adjoining States also provide care and treatment to a substantial number of Massachusetts veterans.

I can tell you that there are plans, although tentative at the present time, to place general medical and surgical beds in Veterans' Administration psychiatric hospitals in Massachusetts. This would mean an increase in bed capacity for patients in this category.

It is true that it has taken considerable time to initiate the nursing home care bed program. However, I am pleased to tell you that the first 1,000 beds have been allocated to Veterans' Administration hospitals in areas where there is demand and facilities can be provided. Studies are underway to provide data that will permit the most equitable distribution of the remaining 3,000 beds.

I am sure you realize that there are many factors to be considered in implementing this program such as workload, local operating conditions, and the availability of appropriate space. However, you may be assured that every possible consideration will be given to the needs of Massachusetts veterans in our planning.

This program is being developed as rapidly as possible. Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, several reasons have been given by the Veterans' Administration in support of the plans to close the Rutland Heights hospital, and all of them are specious, unjustifiable, and untenable.

It is not true, as alleged, that Rutland Heights is obsolescent. The contrary is true. It is solidly constructed, especially well laid out, well equipped, highly suitable, accessible, and well located in an extremely beautiful section of Massachusetts.

The claim that it is too costly to modernize is another gross misstatement, because it is in such good solid condition that it does not need extensive modernization, but merely requires relatively routine changes to accommodate the facilities to the new VA nursing home care bed program and perhaps addition of some new equipment and limited renovation of quarters.

The assertion that the hospital has any special difficulty recruiting professional staff and insuring quality medical care is absolutely inaccurate. Ample, capable staffs always have been, and are currently, available.

The best medical care in the world is within easy striking distance of this hospital, and the present medical, nursing, administrative staff and employees are highly experienced, highly competent, and rank at the very top in ability, diligence, and fitness.

Moreover, the hospital is located within short driving distance of the great med-

ical center complex of the city of Boston, which embraces several outstanding medical schools, talented staffs, numerous highest ranking hospitals, and medical doctors and specialists who are reputed to be the greatest in the world.

All of these facilities and highly skilled doctors are readily available at all times, as the need may demand. In those rare instances when highly specialized medical attention is needed, it is possible for the doctors to travel from Worcester or Boston to Rutland, or to transport emergency patients from Rutland to Worcester or Boston, if the occasion should demand it, in a very short time.

The Government has spent large sums improving and modernizing this fine facility so that the medical attention and services are of the very best quality and the comfort, safety, and welfare of the patients is at all times served and guaranteed.

The physical surroundings, the condition of the facilities, the equipment, the medical nursing staff, the attendants, the administrative group, the employees, and everything about the Rutland Heights hospital clearly indicate that it is a special and general hospital of high-rank.

As I have pointed out, it would be deemed unnecessary to modernize extensively this superb hospital in order to provide new equipment, techniques, and suitable space. For this reason, the cost to the Government would be less than one-tenth of the funds being spent to modernize a large Veterans' Administration hospital in another State.

The geographical position of Rutland, apparently deemed "remote" by the Veterans' Administration, is in the center of our comparatively small State of Massachusetts which contains a population of over 5½ million people, 12 miles from the busy, forward-looking city of Worcester, with a population of 180,000 people and in the heart of Worcester County, which has a population of 500,000 people.

This facility is, if anything, ideally situated and in surroundings of unsurpassed beauty where high altitude, grassy knolls, flowing terrain, and lovely wooded areas combine to lend a scenic quality that can hardly be rivaled at another spot.

By way of contrast, the Veterans' Administration is retaining some hospitals located in places far removed from centers where specialized medical doctors and up-to-date hospitals are not available and where the nearby population is less than one-tenth that of Rutland.

In Worcester County alone there are 75,000 veterans. In Massachusetts there are about 700,000 veterans of whom 75,000 are over 65 years of age. In other New England States, most of which are within driving distance to Rutland, there are an additional 698,000 veterans, of whom 71,000 are over 65 years of age. These include a large segment of veteran population whose members are in advanced years. These aging veterans require more medical care, and often in many cases, are suffering from chronic illnesses that demand continuous expert care.

Rutland Heights Hospital takes care of many patients suffering from chronic conditions, 68 percent of its patient load is over 50 years of age, and represent generally age groups that require more extensive medical care and treatment. In fact, with veterans getting older, day by day and year by year, the need for hospital facilities grows more rather than less.

The sad and shameful fact, Mr. Speaker, is that our aged veterans have become the forgotten men of our generation. All too often, these comrades are simply allowed to vegetate in old men's homes and other institutions despite the gigantic strides made in the treatment of the aged in recent years.

The President and the Veterans' Administration should right the callous and heartless wrong they are about to perpetrate against our aged veterans in the name of economy. New England veterans have always been discriminated against by the lack of domiciliary services in our section of the country. It has been the practice of the Veterans' Administration to meet New England's domiciliary needs through the domiciliary center at Bath, N.Y., now also the victim of the task force economy ax.

This discrimination becomes even more unjust with the closing of Bath this June. Veterans in the whole northeast area will now have to go as far away as Martinsburg, W. Va., Dayton, Ohio, and Keoughan, Va., near Norfolk, for domiciliary care.

I have received and continue to receive daily hundreds of letters in protest against the closing of the Rutland Heights VA Hospital. These protests are well justified because there is no question about the need for these facilities to meet the hospitalization needs of the veterans of our section of the country.

Rutland Heights, which was originally established as a specialized hospital for tubercular patients, assumed a new and important function in the VA hospital system as a general medical and surgical hospital as medical progress helped to reduce the need for tubercular beds. As a result, Rutland Heights, in its new role, was able to absorb the growing overflow of patients who would otherwise have to wait to get into the already overcrowded West Roxbury and Jamaica Plain VA Hospitals.

That the work of Rutland Heights in the VA hospital program is necessary and vital is well evidenced by its average daily patient load over the 11-year period, 1954 to 1964, and I include the patient load chart at this point in the RECORD:

	TB	Surgical	Medical	Total
1954.....	566	None	None	566
1955.....	548	0	2	550
1956.....	512	0	34	546
1957.....	448	0	72	520
1958.....	413	0	104	517
1959.....	358	0	115	473
1960.....	323	0	127	450
1961.....	242	0	214	456
1962.....	227	0	216	443
1963.....	200	36	167	403
1964.....	147	37	207	391

During fiscal year 1964, Rutland Heights had an average daily patient load

of 391 and an 81-percent bed occupancy rate. While many of these patients were from the central Massachusetts area where the hospital is located, a growing percentage of patients came from the Greater Boston area and throughout New England.

If Rutland Heights is closed finally by next June, it is those veterans from the metropolitan area of Boston who will be particularly penalized by having to wait even longer periods for needed hospitalization. Through some slide rule legerdemain, the VA statisticians have decided they can continue to meet the hospital needs of the area by closing Rutland and transferring the patients to the already overcrowded West Roxbury and Jamaica Plain VA hospitals which were unable to accept them in the first place.

Despite their arguments of shifting veteran populations and high operating costs, VA officials have been unable to furnish me with a satisfactory explanation on how they anticipate filling the bed requirements which have been and are being met by the facilities at Rutland Heights. They readily admit that Rutland Heights is carrying on an important function by taking care of the overflow of patients waiting to get into Jamaica Plain and West Roxbury. If and when Rutland Heights is closed, VA officials anticipate transferring the tubercular patients to West Haven, Conn., and the general medical and surgical patients to Jamaica Plain and West Roxbury.

It is obvious that veterans from the Greater Boston area now waiting to get into these two Boston hospitals will be deprived of beds which necessarily must be set aside for the patients from Rutland Heights. In addition, the bed problem at both Boston hospitals will become even more acute as the flow of patients previously channeled to Rutland Heights comes to an end.

The Veterans' Administration knows and I know and my colleagues in the House know who will be the innocent victims of the unsound economy which is being claimed as justifying the closing of Rutland Heights. It will be those gallant men and women to whom a grateful nation made solemn pledges of aid and assistance when they came home from the wars. Not only will our veterans suffer, but their families and dependents will have to endure lengthy waiting periods until hospital care can be provided for the veteran in need and then long trips from their homes to visit their dear ones.

This is truly shocking ingratitude from the richest nation in the world. It is an intolerable situation which the American people will never condone.

Mr. Speaker, last August I had a very striking and vivid example of the wave of picayune economy which has swept over the Veterans' Administration. Upon the receipt of complaints over the quality and quantity of the food being served at the Rutland Heights VA hospital, I wrote the VA officials at Rutland and also Administrator Gleason, seeking clarification of these reports and urging immediate corrective action. That action was promptly taken and I was so advised.

Following is the exchange of correspondence I had on this problem, which I include in the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1964.

Mr. ALAN W. CHADWICK,
Manager, Veterans' Administration Hospital,
Rutland Heights, Mass.

DEAR MR. CHADWICK: Today I received some very serious complaints about the food at your hospital from the spokesman of some of the patients there who has stated that the food is becoming less and less satisfactory both in quality and quantity and that arrangements have been made to go into effect this coming week, to cut down the amount of food across the board for patients at the hospital.

These complaints had no reference to patients on special diets.

I would appreciate it very much if you would look into the matter and let me know just what the situation is, whether curtailments in the quality and quantity of the food are being made and if so whether this action is being done under your instructions or in compliance with instructions from higher authorities.

I appreciate, of course, that there are sometimes unfounded complaints of this kind but in this instance, the source from which I received current complaints are persons well known to me and they are responsible individuals of character and veracity.

Hoping you are getting along well and with thanks, warm regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1964.

Mr. ALAN W. CHADWICK,
Hospital Director,
Veterans' Administration Hospital,
Rutland Heights, Mass.

DEAR MR. CHADWICK: Thank you for your letter outlining your new ration patterns at the Rutland Heights Hospital.

I may state that it is the first time in many years that I have had complaints about food in veterans hospitals.

I think it is ridiculous beyond expression to limit the patients at your hospital to one egg for breakfast unless it is done under the specific orders of a doctor. Congress provides plenty of money for the veterans hospitals and services to our veterans, and we intend that they shall be well cared for and well fed at all times, and I don't think that we will permit them to be treated like guinea pigs and denied proper food. I think there are few people in this country indeed who are willing to practice economy in veterans hospitals at the expense of our disabled and sick veterans.

Of course, I also appreciate that you may be merely complying with directives, and for that reason I am taking the matter up at a higher level.

With warm regards and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1, 1964.

HON. JOHN S. GLEASON, JR.,
Administrator of Veterans Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I am greatly disturbed about complaints of inadequate food that I have received at the Rutland Heights VA hospital in my district, and thought I should forward you the enclosed letter that I received from Alan W. Chadwick, director at that hospital.

I have been informed by some patients who are very good friends of mine that the food at the hospital has been cut down in quantity and that veterans can get only one egg for breakfast, reduced meat portions, etc., and on the whole, according to my reports, they seem to feel that the food is inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Since we have never had any trouble in recent times at Rutland or in other Massachusetts VA hospitals, I wish you would advise me whether the practices now being carried out at Rutland as explained by Mr. Chadwick are nationwide or just at Rutland or certain other hospitals or what the situation is.

Obviously, this is a very serious situation. Please advise me.

Hoping you are getting along well, and with thanks, warm regards, and best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Rutland Heights, Mass.,
September 11, 1964.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Clinton, Mass.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: Thank you for your letter of September 1, 1964.

The expression of your feelings on food served to the patients at this hospital was most welcome.

Upon receipt of your letter of August 21, 1964, we immediately initiated necessary action to correct any and all deficiencies with respect to the quantity and quality of food served. We are happy to state that there appears to be complete satisfaction on the part of all patients. We well realize that psychologically food is an important part of everyone's well-being.

Your interest in bringing to our attention matters such as this is sincerely appreciated and most helpful.

Sincerely,

DAVID W. MILLER,
Acting Hospital Director.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE
OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VET-
ERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1964.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PHIL: This is in further reply to your letter concerning complaints you received about the food situation at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Rutland Heights, Mass.

Our Rutland Heights hospital was 1 of 28 Veterans' Administration hospitals designated to participate as a test station in a study of single ration allowance for menu planning and cost control. Two plans were placed in effect. This hospital participated in one plan for the period January 1 through June 30, 1964, without significant problems. Since July 1 the second plan has been in effect. This plan generated patient dissatisfaction.

The hospital brought this matter to the attention of our dietetic service and requested permission to revert to the former plan. Since patient satisfaction is of primary concern to us, the hospital's request has been granted and funds have been provided to support the former ration plan. We believe this action will resolve the complaint received from the patients.

Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, JR.,
Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Massachusetts delegation in Congress is united against the closing of Rutland Heights and it is

most difficult to understand the Veterans' Administration rationalization of this proposal.

That the hospital is not needed is refuted by the VA's own statistics showing an average patient load of nearly 400 patients daily during all of 1964.

That the hospital is outdated is refuted by VA expenditures of over \$4 million to make it in better condition than newer VA hospitals.

That the VA has not found it difficult to recruit a staff is evidenced by the some 500 capable, faithful, and dedicated employees making up the medical staff and hospital personnel.

Another reported deficiency is that Rutland Heights is not associated with a medical school. What is obvious, as I have already pointed out, is that Rutland Heights can draw upon the outstanding medical specialists at nearby Worcester and Boston. In addition, it is located in the center of New England in the heart of Massachusetts with its relatively small area and large population.

If the Veterans' Administration plans on using the association and proximity of its hospitals to medical schools as guiding criteria, it might be well for my colleagues in the House to take a close look at the VA medical facilities in their States before they, too, become the targets of the VA computers and statisticians.

The Veterans' Administration estimates it will save \$23.5 million in administrative or overhead costs by closing the 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries affected by the January 13 closing order. These alleged savings at the expense of the welfare of the veteran and his loved ones are indefensible other than to those officials who feel that veterans should receive no special consideration or what little consideration the general public welfare assistance programs can accord them.

Since the closing of the splendid Rutland Heights facility is unjustified, since it is urgently needed to provide our beloved veterans with the care and treatment the American people and the Congress insist that they have, I urge every vigorous action to retain this fine hospital at Rutland Heights and all other veteran hospitals that are needed to insure the best treatment and care for those whose heroism, valor, and sacrifice saved this Nation and the free world. I respectfully urge this action upon our great President and my esteemed colleagues of the Congress.

NOW OR NEVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in view of our having put off consideration until Monday next of the supplemental appropriation for Commodity Credit Corporation, which was to have gone to conference today, I should like to take this time to inform the Members of the action I was prepared to take today and will take on Monday next.

You will recall when the bill was considered in the House I offered a motion to recommit with instructions, "that no part of this appropriation shall be used during the fiscal year 1965 to finance the export of any agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic under the provisions of title I of such act," and this motion was adopted by a vote of 204 to 177.

The measure went over to the other body and yesterday the bill was passed by a voice vote with four amendments:

The first amendment restricts the use of funds to eliminate agricultural research stations until Congress has considered and acted thereon.

The second amendment would take \$220,000 of funds previously appropriated and permit their use for the installation of temperature and humidity control equipment for the Metabolism and Radiation Laboratory at Fargo, N. Dak.

The third amendment which passed 44 to 38 is the one which, for all practical purposes, nullifies the amendment adopted by this House on my motion to recommit. The Senate did, as a matter of fact, retain the language of my amendment, word for word, but added to it the following:

Except when such exports are necessary to carry out the sales agreement entered into October 8, 1962, as amended, and if the President determines that the financing of such exports is in the national interest.

The fourth amendment would prevent the proposed closing of VA hospitals or other facilities.

To make sure that we have another separate rollcall vote on the amendment adopted by this House and possibly on one or more of the other three amendments adopted by the Senate, I am going to offer a motion to instruct the conferees.

The mechanics of this action will be as follows: the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, will move to send the bill to conference. I shall not object at this point, and as a matter of fact, under one of the new rules we adopted as this session got underway, it would take a majority vote of the House to sustain an objection. When we have agreed to send the bill to conference, and just prior to the Speaker's appointment of the conferees on the part of the House, I shall offer my motion.

Normally, there would not be any really important business to take up next Monday, and conceivably many Members could be out of town. This will, of course, be a crucial vote, and I would hope that we would still have the strong bipartisan support that was so prevalent when we adopted my amendment in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to devote the balance of my remarks to amendment No. 3.

The issue before the House is very clear—if you want to bar the use of U.S. surplus food to bolster the economy and the war machine of President Nasser for use against our allies in Africa, then you should vote to instruct the conferees.

If you do not care whether Nasser uses our food to feed his 47,000 troops, destroying freedom in Yemen, or whether our surplus food frees other money for him to pay for arms to help the Congolese rebels slaughter our missionaries, then vote against my motion to instruct the conferees.

As pointed out in Arthur Krock's column in the New York Times of February 2, Nasser plans to use the currency generated by the sale of surplus food to free other money to pay for arms to be used to destroy the present pro-U.S. Congo Government and to arm Communists in Cyprus. In his article Mr. Krock writes:

Of the payments in local currency made by Egypt to the U.S. Government for shipment of surplus foodstuffs, 85 percent is in effect returned as a gift. What the Egyptian Government does with this gift in current circumstances was precisely stated in a Cairo dispatch to this newspaper under date of January 2: "It will help free money that President Nasser can spend on arms shipments to the Congo, to Cyprus, to Algeria, or south Arabia, to oppose the United States and its allies."

Mr. Krock goes on to say:

This is the situation which impelled the House of Representatives last week by a vote of 204 to 177 to stop further execution of the 1962 agreement between the two Governments for surplus food deliveries to the total worth of about \$431.8 million.

The worth of the undelivered remainder for which the necessary contractual steps have not been taken, is \$37 million. But there is a concluded contract for another \$30 million worth that has not yet been shipped.

Well, now, these figures Mr. Krock cites are substantially correct. I pointed out in my remarks when we were considering the bill on the House floor that the \$431.8 million was the "export" value figure, and that actually taking into account the net realized losses suffered by the Commodity Credit Corporation, it was carried on the books of that corporation as a transaction amounting to \$583.8 million.

Now the situation has not changed since we had the vote in the House. Nasser certainly has not changed, nor is there any "hard intelligence" that he will. Our policy of selling these surplus farm commodities to Nasser has not changed, and there is no indication from the President or his advisers that it will change.

In fact on the very day the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee eased the ban on foods to Cairo, Nasser's Egyptian Government agreed to represent Communist China in Burundi, after that government closed the Peiping Embassy and invited its officials to leave because of subversive activities.

This "sign of our times" shows the link that Communist China has established with Nasser in Africa and how closely they are working together.

If administration officials would only look at their intelligence reports, they would learn that Nasser is delivering to the Congolese rebels some of the latest model Soviet-made weapons—including some that are even better than those in the U.S. Army's table of organization.

One such weapon, I understand, is a recoilless repeating bazooka, which startled intelligence experts of both the military and the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we do not want to be a partner with Nasser and the Soviet Union in putting these arms in the hands of the Congolese rebels who are bent on destroying all of our missionaries of whatever faith, in the Congo.

It is Nasser who is denying food to his own people by helping the Soviet Union wage their "wars of destruction" throughout Africa.

Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1965, Acting Secretary of State George W. Ball, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee as follows:

We ask, therefore, that the Congress not limit the President's freedom of action in the conduct of our relations with this key country during the weeks ahead.

Mr. Speaker, title VII, United States Code, section 1721 states:

In order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the peoples of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available to the President out of its stocks such surplus agricultural commodities (as defined in section 1706 of this title) as he may request, for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements of such nation, and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, that under the law, the President may use his contingency fund if he feels the good faith and honor of this country has been affected by House action on House Joint Resolution 234.

In summary, then, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind Members of the House that my amendment was limited to title I sales under Public Law 480. It does not affect title II, III, and IV, and under these titles the President, in my opinion, still has plenty of room to maneuver if he sees fit, for under title II the President has the authority to donate surplus agricultural commodities to nations to meet emergencies; under title III, the President has the authority to assist international welfare agencies, international feeding programs, and to participate in barter transactions; under title IV, the President has the authority to sell surplus agricultural commodities to nations for dollars.

Now, to those who would argue that the Congress has no right to act as we did in this area, I would remind them that Public Law 480 was a creation of the Congress, and so we have every right to amend provisions, oversee, and evaluate its operation, or repeal it, for that matter.

I do hope the House will stick by its guns and stand by its original position, by voting in support of my motion to instruct the conferees when this matter comes up for consideration next Monday.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON AMENDMENT RELATING TO SALE OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES TO THE UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC UNDER TITLE I OF PUBLIC LAW 480

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a statement of President Johnson at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's statement at his press conference on the amendment relating to sales of surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480 is as follows:

Last week the House adopted a proposal that would, if enacted, preclude the United States from carrying out our present 3-year agreement, ending this June, to sell surplus commodities to the United Arab Republic under title I of Public Law 480. Yesterday, the Senate passed a modified version of this proposal, which would permit the completion of details of the agreement if I, as the President, determine this to be in our national interest.

It is of the greatest importance that the flexibility provided to me by the Senate action be sustained by the Congress. Our relations with the United Arab Republic present difficult problems in a highly sensitive area of the world; the area where tensions are high. The basic purpose of our policy in this area has been, and will continue to be, the protection of our vital interests. To do this it is essential that I have freedom of action.

It is obvious that an improvement in relations between our two countries will require efforts on both sides. It is impossible to predict whether such an improvement would be achieved. But if there is to be any chance of success at all, it can only be if I have adequate flexibility to deal with this complex and volatile situation.

RACIAL TROUBLE IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intent to answer anything that has been said to those of us who have voluntarily taken upon ourselves the opportunity to travel and assist a State of this Union. I have personally been invited by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference and by Dr. King and by citizens of Selma to observe what is going on in that State. It is not my intent to test any law, and it is not my intent even to stay in one of the hotels of that State. It is my intent to stay in a Negro home when I go to Selma, Ala., and to return to Washington with great dispatch. I do not consider my trip to Alabama or to any other State of the Union as being for the purpose of agitating or engaging in any type of activity which would prompt anyone to be placed in danger. It is my intent to go as an

observer. I certainly will avail myself of the opportunity to seek information on both sides. I would hope that the public officials of that State would meet with us and try to work out with us some understanding of what is happening in that State. A few days ago I saw a picture in the newspaper. I do not know whether it is authentic or not, but this was a picture of a woman, and it happened to be a Negro woman, who was lying on the ground. Three sheriffs were on top of her and a police stick was upraised and used on this woman while she was on the ground. This does not, to me, as an American citizen, portray the image of a good State nor, certainly, of law-abiding individuals engaged in the proper enforcement of the law. If this happened in my city, I quite assure you that there would certainly be a great uproar. I am not judging this and I am not saying that this woman was right or wrong and I am not saying that the law officials were right or wrong. However, it certainly indicates to me that there may be something wrong, for which reason other Americans at least should attempt to observe the situation so that they will have some knowledge of what is going on there. As I have indicated, others will be going with me. I am certainly not the chairman of this group. I did not organize it. I am simply one who has seen fit to join it. I certainly hope that the expressions that have been made today on both sides will be helpful in bringing about some type of understanding of what has happened in our American society.

To me brotherhood is not so wild a dream as it is to those who propose postponing it pretend. Personally I believe we can bring about brotherhood even in the Southern States. I was born in a southern State myself before my family migrated to Los Angeles. So I think I can speak as a southerner. I think I know something of the feelings of southerners. I know of the great emotions that have been aroused as a result of some of these happenings. I know that this Congress has passed three laws to secure the voting rights of the citizens of every State of this Union. I do know and feel that some of these laws are not being upheld. Whether the law should be strengthened is something which is certainly worthy of some attention. If I shall have observed something in Alabama that might make me a better Congressman or put me in a better position to recommend something to strengthen brotherhood in our country then I think certainly a great mission will have been accomplished.

I doubt seriously that this will be a world-shaking event. I do feel that neither I nor anyone else will be placed in jeopardy for making this trip. And I should certainly hope that the State of Alabama will profit as much as my own State from my trip to Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that I am going at my own expense. As has been indicated I voluntarily designated myself to go to this State. There has been no impression given that this is an official committee of this House or that

we are speaking for any other Member of this House. We are going merely as observers. I hope that my colleagues from Alabama will join us on this mission, will meet with us and join with us in a spirit of cooperation, as that has been expressed, so that we may bring back something more constructive.

As I have said, this is a simple trip of an American citizen to an American State of this Union and as such it seems to me it should be supported by all of us and not condemned by any of us.

THE FARM MESSAGE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the President's message should set at rest the very proper concern which has disturbed so many of our people since the Director of the Budget wrote his much quoted article which many people interpreted to indicate a desire to force some 2½ million farm families out of their homes.

The President is a practical man and he has repudiated any such proposal.

He realizes that even though some of those now living on the farm will not be able to make a reasonable livelihood farming that it is much better for these people to stay where they are than it is to move them into the big cities.

The President's message clearly outlines the problems of our rural people and suggests a continuation of our present voluntary price support and production adjustment programs. I think this is a wise and a sound approach. As a Member of Congress I shall try to help the President keep these programs in operation.

I would emphasize, as did the President, that every impartial study has shown that the removal of price and income supports would have a catastrophic effect on farm income and farm income is too vital to our entire economy to be dealt with lightly. I am happy that the President has again indicated his deep concern for the welfare of those who provide the food and fiber for America.

THE SITUATION IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have a strong belief that the situation and the circumstances in Selma, Ala., are of such importance as to merit consideration by the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. The appropriate authority in this House for such an inquiry into these facts and circumstances I believe is the Committee on the Judiciary of the

House of Representatives. I have therefore today requested the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to select from the membership of that committee a number of its members to visit Selma, Ala., for the express purpose of determining for themselves what the actual facts are. This committee of the House has direct jurisdiction over the legislative matters involved herein. I believe we should immediately determine the actual facts as they are found to exist in Selma, Ala.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary will act promptly and accede to my request that members of that committee be dispatched in a quasi-official mission to Selma, Ala., so that this House may have before it a complete recital of the facts and circumstances as they actually exist.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to point out, as I did earlier today, that responsible citizens of Selma have asked that a duly appointed and impartial congressional group come down and ascertain the correct facts. Day before yesterday both the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE ANDREWS] and I talked with Chairman EMANUEL CELLER of the House Judiciary Committee and made that request. We also appeared yesterday before the Senate Judiciary Committee with the same request. We felt that any investigative group that goes to Alabama should be composed of members of the Judiciary Committees of both the House and the Senate. Although no action has been taken as yet on our request, I am introducing today a joint resolution the purpose of which is to set up a joint committee in the event either Judiciary Committee chairman feels he presently does not have the authority to make these appointments.

Mr. Speaker, while I question the advisability, I certainly do not question the right of any Member of this body or any citizen of the United States to visit Selma. It should be made perfectly clear, however, that any self-appointed group from the Congress that goes to Selma does not in any way represent an investigative committee of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MOORE. I took note of the meetings that were announced by the gentleman from Alabama and one of his colleagues. I believe as a supporter of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 it is entirely appropriate for me as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary to request that that committee which has the legislative jurisdiction in this area should move to obtain the facts and circumstances that exist there. I have, therefore, asked Chairman CELLER as a member of the committee, to follow through and designate Members to officially go down and take a look at the situation.

Mr. SELDEN. I want to say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] that I welcome his support.

THE FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS PROGRAM

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, everyone concerned with the manner in which the foreign oil imports program affects the domestic industry and national security will want to read the incisive statement of Mr. M. D. Abel, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association, made in response to a recent report of the Department of the Interior.

The Government reports that the oil industry is enjoying prosperity. But the prosperity of the huge international companies should not be confused with the relative depression for domestic independents, who do not benefit from the foreign oil import program. The Government, in fact, concedes that the small independent producer is in trouble, and that there is a problem of inadequate exploration. Many authorities see a direct link between the present foreign oil import quotas and the deteriorating conditions in the domestic oil industry. It is to this problem that Mr. M. D. Abel addressed his remarks.

With unanimous consent I am inserting the statement of M. D. Abel, president of the Texas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES

Hard-pressed domestic independent oil producers can only regard the Kelly-Lattu report as a pitifully inadequate and grossly misleading "appraisal" of the petroleum industry in this Nation.

If the forthcoming Interior Department hearings concerning the oil imports program are to be approached in this context, there seems little hope that present officials will prove any more willing now than in the past to face up to the real issue of a fast-growing imbalance in this industry. The question was not whether "the oil industry" is enjoying prosperity, or whether adequate resources are available to meet foreseeable consumer needs. Rather the need was for information as to extent of and cause for a relative depression for domestic independents during peak prosperity for international companies. We have here a case of poverty amid plenty, pure and simple, or what Gov. John Connally has called "our own Appalachia" in the prosperous oil industry. However correct may be the assertion that Interior had available inadequate statistics for a comprehensive look at independents, it could overlook only with great difficulty the mountains of evidence that present governmental policies are failing to come to grips with the problem, and that the oil imports program in particular is not even approaching declared objectives.

Particularly distressing is the virtual rejection of the national security concept which underlies the oil imports program. Entirely beside the point is the Interior declaration that national security extends "far beyond the limited objective of assuring a supply to meet our own needs during a national emergency," and that national security embraces

the security of both the United States and its free world allies, and both domestic and foreign sources of petroleum. The section relating to the import control program is largely given over to emphasis upon the objective of maintaining prosperous and happy foreign oil sources. International considerations are due attention, of course, but this report would seem to subordinate all other considerations to the preservation of available supplies from other countries.

It's one thing to say, as does the report, that "the United States needs the oil resources of the Middle East," and there is for the security of NATO nations "an equally compelling need for continuing production in other major producing areas." However, it is another thing entirely to infer that U.S. security commitments in the Eastern Hemisphere require importation of Mideast oil into this country. In fact, such movement tends to weaken security objectives of both this Nation and her allies.

The security clause in the Trade Act prescribes criteria relating to the objective of a healthy home industry. If Interior officials do not like this limited concept, and wish to insist upon a one-world resource viewpoint, then they should lobby for a change in the law. In the meantime, there should be adherence to the law as Congress wrote it and, we believe, as Congress intended to write it.

We submit that Congress had good reason to concern itself with U.S. relative self-sufficiency of this No. 1 munition of war. Only an adequate supply available from home sources can assure us the bargaining power to obtain oil resources from other nations on terms which are both economically reasonable and relatively secure. Any one of our major import sources could be cut off in short order, as was the case no later than 1957 when the Suez Canal was closed and the Middle East supply denied us and our free world allies. The day America loses her relative self-sufficiency in oil, foreign oil will cease to be cheap in any sense. Congress recognized this, whether or not Interior officials wish to do so today.

The report concedes that the small independent producer is in trouble, and that there is a problem of inadequate exploration. But it appears not to recognize the direct link between these two occurrences.

It notes the need for developing new reserves without increasing output, but purports to see this as primarily a problem for State conservation reform. Overdevelopment of the 1950's is called the most important reason exploration is not keeping pace with expanded requirements, when, in fact, virtually all increased domestic demand since has been supplied from imports and offshore leases, and it is these less secure sources which account for our surpluses today.

It infers that the loss of ground by independents to the major companies is a natural result corresponding to shifts in crude production from older to newer areas, noting that major companies rather than independents drill the deeper and better prospects. It thereby ignores that Federal policy favoring more prolific offshore production, largely on Federal lands, accounts for a substantial part of the surplus. The problem is not so much that independents haven't shared in deeper offshore development as it is the fact that surplus output from this major-company-dominated source has denied independents the economic incentive to drill anywhere, including the shallow prospects which are available to them.

A basic problem raised by the report is the combination of "excess" productive capacity (some 700,000 barrels per day over total demand) and insufficient exploration to cover tomorrow's needs. In detailing the many assumed causes for this situation, very great

care was taken to rule out even the possibility that an inadequate imports program underlies the problem.

It would seem obvious that imports—which along with offshore production has accounted for virtually all demand increases during the life of the mandatory program—must be required to mark time until domestic production assumes a better balanced share of the total U.S. liquids hydrocarbon market. Only then will domestic independents be in financial condition to restore lagging exploration activities.

It speaks of a "well-defined trend" toward fewer and fewer smaller companies, acknowledges the shrinkage of their share of total production, and then forecasts a continuation of this trend. Recent developments, it says, may signal only "the onset of a long-term trend toward fewer and larger independents." Sellouts and mergers are pictured as a logical result of the fact that "at any point in time, a given producer may determine that his financial interests are better served by sale of oil in place rather than by continuing to produce." It thereby interprets as a normal and healthy trend toward efficiency what is in fact an alarming trend toward monopoly concentration in this great industry.

Interior's report curiously poses problems without penetrating beyond superficial causes, and then tends to dismiss need for solutions. A case in point is the product imbalance situation which has led to serious products price erosion in recent years. Noting that uneconomic domestic residual fuel output is on the wane, the report indicates satisfaction over refiners' resultant opportunity to cut down domestic crude needs and at the same time utilize new processes to increase output of other products. At the same time it recognizes that "other products" are in oversupply already. Yet the practice of dumping gasoline on the market, with resulting price wars, is simply criticized as illogical without relation to import policy. Ignored is the obvious: if imports are to be relied upon increasingly to meet demand for residual fuel, then other product imports and imported crude must be correspondingly reduced to avoid excess supplies on the domestic market. As a matter of fact, the report carefully eliminates residual fuel oil and its portion of total demand from virtually all charts, tables, and discussions relating to the supply-demand problem.

It is unfortunate indeed that, as we approach the hearings on the oil imports program, Interior would find occasion to gloss over industry conditions in such sweeping generalities as the following: "The industry as a whole is growing, it is in excellent financial shape, and it is demonstrating daily its ability to live in today's competitive world."

The facts are that Federal policy is failing to provide an adequate foundation for a healthy domestic oil industry so essential to our national economy and security. Both with respect to Interior's implementation of the oil import control objectives, and its handling of Federal offshore lands, the Federal Government is seriously weakening the capacity of domestic producers to fulfill their obligation to this Nation.

We hope that the hearing will provide no stacked cards for setting and reevaluating Federal policy.

In general, this report clearly necessitates a new approach on our part. The facts of our distress, and of inadequate domestic exploration, have been recognized beyond dispute. But Interior officials responsible for this report not only misapply these basic facts, in such a way as to minimize considerations of a more adequate import program, but also serve up a number of inconsistencies in the process.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE SOVIET UNION FOR PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House concurrent resolution condemning the Soviet Union for persecution of the Jews.

I have asked representatives from both political parties and from all sections of the country to join me in condemning Russia for singling out Jews for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, confiscating synagogues, closing Jewish cemeteries, arresting rabbis, and lay religious leaders, and curtailing religious observances.

My resolution also protests the Russian practice of discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and through other acts oppressing Jews in the free exercise of their faith.

An identical resolution has been offered in the Senate by Senator ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, and 67 cosponsors. I have asked House Members to introduce resolutions identical to mine so that the House and Senate resolutions would be uniform and so that by a showing of significant support the Foreign Affairs Committee will be encouraged to take early action.

I am delighted to announce, Mr. Speaker, that I have been joined by many Members of this body, who have indicated to me that they share my concern and views. I wish to thank each of my colleagues for their supporting resolutions. Further, I call to the attention of the House that these resolutions have been introduced simultaneously, indicating a unanimity of concern.

PERSECUTION OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join more than 80 of our colleagues in sponsoring a concurrent resolution condemning Soviet anti-Semitism and the singling out of Soviet citizens of the Jewish faith for extreme punishment for alleged economic crimes.

On January 4, 1965, I introduced House Resolution 50 expressing the same sentiments on the part of the House alone. The concurrent resolution in the other body to the one the House receives today

states the unanimity of opinion on this matter on the part of the resolution's adherents in both the Houses of the Congress.

As I stated last year, when I introduced an identical House resolution, it is clear that the Soviet Government and the Communist Party have fostered and encouraged religious persecution in the Soviet Union. In the case of its Jewish citizens, the Soviet Government has singled them out in reporting arrests and executions for alleged economic crimes; it has confiscated synagogues, closed Jewish cemeteries, arrested Rabbis, curtailed religious observances and Jewish cultural activities.

It is my hope, and I know the hope of those others of our colleagues joining in the sponsorship of this resolution today, that the Soviet Government, in the name of decency and humanity, will cease its persecution of Soviet Jews and permit the free exercise of religion by all of its citizens.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART II

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part II of the New York Herald Tribune series on "New York City in Crisis."

The following installment concerns the tragic failure of urban renewal in New York City and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on January 26, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—URBAN RENEWAL HOPE: PLAGUED BY INDECISION—AROUSSED AND INDIGNANT

"We're fighting all over the world to preserve democracy and then we find ourselves kicked in the teeth in our own city," said one caller to the Herald Tribune. He was among scores of citizens responding yesterday to the first article of "New York City in Crisis," and among millions of New Yorkers who feel that the greatest city in the world may no longer be the greatest place in which to live. The Herald Tribune is presenting this special investigative series on the deeply disturbing characteristics of a city in crisis with the aim of ending the bewilderment, frustration, rage, fear, and indifference that have become hallmarks of city life. It welcomes any public reaction and hopes that out of these articles can come some positive direction to reopen the channels of civic creativity: Whether in terms of individual response, a banding together of citizens, or a change in the pattern of municipal responsibility.)

(By Barry Gottehrer and Marshall Peck)

To New York and dozens of other cities, fighting a seemingly endless, sometimes futile war against spreading slums, urban renewal has become the chief—and essential—weapon for progress. But in New York—and elsewhere to varying degrees—it is frequently a peculiar sort of progress, one that destroys slums out of necessity but one that also often destroys small businesses and uproots lower income families out of ignorance, incompetence and indecision.

Despite the city's extravagant claims, the 15-year-old slum-clearance program in New York has consistently failed to live up to its original purpose—"the realization as soon as feasible of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family."

The slum-clearance program officially came into being in 1949 with the passage of the title I section of the Federal Housing Act. Under the legislation, the Federal Government agreed to pay cities for slum clearance and redeveloping by putting up two-thirds (the other third to be paid in full by the city or split between the city and the State) of the cost of buying up and clearing slum areas. The cleared land was then to be turned over to builders and developers at a considerably lower price than they would have had to pay if they had cleared the land themselves.

WHEN IT BEGAN

The term "urban renewal" was brought into use in 1954 when the Federal Housing Act was extended to provide Federal assistance on a similar basis for conservation, rehabilitation and comprehensive planning and redevelopment.

Since 1949, the U.S. Government has approved more than \$4 billion worth of urban renewal contributions nationally, with more than \$263 million allocated for New York City. Out of this, after 15 years, the city now has 41 federally aided projects totaling 63,074 apartment units in varying stages of planning or construction.

Through last month, however, only 3 of these 41 projects and only 24,052 of these 63,074 apartments were listed as completed by the housing and redevelopment board. In a city in which the slums and ghettos continue to spread and where there is a desperate need for more public and middle-income housing, 15 years of urban-renewal work and money have not made notably impressive headway.

The failure of the city's urban renewal program—coupled with a severe shortage of public housing (New York voters rejected 2 amendments last November that would have provided 2,500 additional public-housing units)—has made the housing problem one of the most critical facing the city.

Some 1.2 million New Yorkers live in substandard housing today and more than 600,000 need to and can't get into public housing.

The white, middle class continues to desert the city (more than 800,000 have left since 1950) because the apartments in Manhattan are, for the most part, too small or too expensive.

And the city's Negroes and Puerto Ricans, the principal victims of urban renewal, continue to be pushed from one slum to another.

One of the most outspoken and articulate critics of haphazardly administered and poorly planned urban renewal is Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, whose 17th Congressional District includes the Bellevue South area. To the Republican Congressman, urban renewal is necessary for progress. But he seems to feel that in New York City urban renewal has unfortunately been allowed to become a necessary evil instead of a necessary good in many instances.

"The purpose of the Housing Act of 1949 is not served when we indiscriminately erase whole communities from the map," says Mr. LINDSAY. "We must stop destroying neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. We must stop ruining businesses, scattering the families we should keep and creating greater pressure on deteriorating housing—all in the name of urban renewal. Past programs have been urban removal rather than urban renewal."

PAYING THE PRICE

To a great extent, New York City today is paying for the capricious manner in which

the urban renewal program was run through the years. Under the direction of master builder Robert Moses and his committee on slum clearance, the urban renewal or title I program—as it was originally called—was the subject of criticism and the object of controversy almost from the beginning.

Unlike other cities, which would relocate the residents and then clear the land before turning the sites over to private developers, New York insisted upon turning over the sites with the buildings still standing and the tenants still paying rent. This was done because Mr. Moses said it was the only way he could get firm commitments from developers. And what Mr. Moses wanted, Mr. Moses got.

It was precisely this policy, which allowed developers to delay relocation and clearance almost indefinitely while collecting rents from their slum tenants, that led to the start of the program's troubles. By mid-1956, with 10 projects approved but all running far behind schedule, hints of scandal and criticism of the way many slum residents were being treated were commonplace. But the biggest explosion—centering around the Manhattantown project, a six-block area between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West and 97th and 100th Streets—was yet to come.

The plan, calling for the construction of 17 apartment houses with 2,720 units, was approved by the board of estimate in September of 1951 and scheduled for completion by August of 1956. Manhattantown, Inc.—a group of developers headed by a builder named Jack Ferman and Samuel Caspert, who previously had been appointed a city marshal by Mayor William O'Dwyer—obtained the six-block area, which the city had condemned for \$16.3 million, for \$3.1 million, putting up only \$1 million in cash.

THE MANHATTANTOWN STORY

But it wasn't until the fall of 1954 when the U.S. Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a 1-day hearing in New York that the story began to leak out.

Mr. Caspert disclosed how he had set up a separate firm headed by his son-in-law which bought all the refrigerators and gas ranges in the Manhattantown tenements for \$33,000.

The son-in-law then rented the exact same refrigerators and ranges back to Manhattantown which, in less than a year, paid him \$115,326. Though the Senate committee reported that \$649,215 had been siphoned out of the Manhattantown project by similar methods in its first 18 months of operation, no official action was taken by either Mayor Wagner or Mr. Moses.

When charges of irregularities continued and the project's scheduled completion day came in August of 1956 without a single building having even been started, Mr. Moses blamed the Federal officials for taking too much time in underwriting a loan for the developers. Yet even when the loans were approved the Manhattantown developers did not pick them up. The situation became so bad in the Manhattantown tenements that one tenant complained she had no hot water for 3 months and no water at all for 1 month.

By mid-1957, the dimensions of the problem no longer could be evaded or denied. Though developers were collecting millions of dollars in rent from slum tenements throughout the city, some of them had not even bothered to pay their taxes or interest to the city. Of the \$1 million owed the city, Manhattantown owed more than \$414,000.

THE MAYOR'S VIEW

Finally, on June 11, 1957, the slum clearance committee recommended that the city start foreclosure action to repossess the Manhattantown site. Nearly 6 years after the

project had first been approved, Manhattan town had not paid its taxes (which now totaled \$620,000), had not cleared its land, had not started construction of its first apartment, and had not even picked up its Federal commitments.

At a city hall press conference, Mayor Wagner, who had steadfastly supported the slum clearance committee and its chairman and would continue to do so, was asked why he had done nothing but deny all charges involving Manhattantown in the past.

"We were misled," said the mayor.

"You mean to say you were conned for 5 years?" asked one reporter, who had been a persistent critic of the Manhattantown setup.

"Well, if you want to put it that way—yes," he said. "I guess you could say we were conned for 5 years."

Ultimately, under a new sponsor (Webb and Knapp, later replaced by Alcoa Residences, Inc.) and under a new name (Park West Village), the Manhattantown project became a reality. Today, 2,525 units are occupied (at rents between \$28 and \$55 a room) and another 140 are under way.

Manhattantown, however, wasn't the only urban renewal project tainted with scandal and dotted with irregularities. In others, it also became obvious that urban renewal might not always work for the benefit of the slum residents, but it certainly didn't harm the developers.

At one point, the program was being run so haphazardly that a Federal Housing Administrator in Washington reportedly decided to do something about it. According to the story, the Administrator sent word to the slum clearance committee in New York that further funds would be withheld until the city cleaned up its program, eliminated the scandal, and started providing better housing and relocation for the people pushed out.

Within a week, the Administrator reportedly received a call from a superior. The message was supposed to have been loud and clear: "Leave Bob Moses and New York alone."

The Administrator is said to have taken the advice and Mr. Moses, whose own honesty and integrity have never been questioned, continued to administer New York's urban renewal program in the way he saw fit.

(The Tribune repeatedly has attempted to interview Mr. Moses about his role in the city's urban renewal program and its history, but has been told that Mr. Moses would under no condition speak to anyone from this newspaper about anything.)

Finally in 1960, the housing and redevelopment board was established to take over the duties of the slum clearance committee and six other municipal programs. Unfortunately in New York, unlike several other cities (Boston, for one), the urban renewal program and the city's planning unit, both of which overlap in many areas, were not brought under a single administration.

A PLANNING DECISION

It is still up to the city planning commission, which has received \$3.7 million from the Federal Government under a new urban renewal arm called the community renewal program, to hold preliminary hearings and designate specific areas for urban renewal.

It is then up to the HRB to request additional funds from the Federal Government for further study of these designated areas and, perhaps someday, for ultimate condemnation and clearance. Theoretically the HRB cannot initiate an urban renewal project and the planning commission cannot complete one.

Caught up in this massive bureaucracy and this needless duplication of time, money, and effort, hundreds, of thousands of New York-

ers must wait—unable to move because there is no place to move to and unable to repair their homes or businesses because banks are extremely reluctant to extend credit to someone whose business or home might be torn down in the next few years.

What then is the difference between the city's urban renewal program 5 years ago and today? Essentially, the difference seems to be that the people running the program now have their hearts in the right place. There are still occasional whispers of scandal, but they are infrequent and unsubstantiated.

Under Chairman Milton Mollen, who last week was named to coordinate all of the city's housing programs, the HRB picked up the cry of other cities in following the leadership of New Haven Mayor Richard Lee and his emphasis on human renewal. Mr. Mollen tactfully avoids criticizing the old slum clearance committee ("I'd rather not talk about the past," he says), but believes that the entire emphasis of the program has changed for the better—"from simply clearing slums to a concern for the problems they symptomize."

"I think urban renewal is the hope of many areas of the city," he says. "Without it, there's uncertainty. As it is, there's inaction on one hand. In certain areas, such as Bedford-Stuyvesant, private enterprise won't go in. On the other hand, in other areas, private real estate interests are moving in. They only disrupt the neighborhood and they provide no relocation for the people."

In New York now, the department of relocation, which was set up in November of 1962, has taken the job of urban-renewal relocating away from the builders. And the city itself—and not the builders—remains in control of the apartments and stores, collecting the rents until everyone is relocated and the site is cleared. Then—and only then—is the land turned over to the developers.

These are decided improvements—steps in the right direction—but the administration of the program and its accomplishments remain far from impressive.

One need look no further than Lincoln Center for a vivid example of the city's urban-renewal program at its very best and, yet at the same time, still not satisfying everyone.

At its best, the Lincoln Center project cleared away a seriously blighted area and provided the city with a cultural core—including a new theater, a new philharmonic hall, and an opera house—that any city in the world would be proud to possess.

Yet even here—where the beauty and worth of the cultural center so clearly demonstrate a step forward from the slum it replaced—there has been criticism—and, to a degree, the criticism is valid.

CAUSE FOR CRITICISM

In the place of the low rent, admittedly slum housing, a string of expensive apartment houses has been built—far out of the price range of the people these buildings have dispossessed. This is the continuing failure of urban renewal—this aimless traffic and removal of lower income people from one slum to another—and it is one that New York officials have been unable to solve.

HRB officials are quick to point out that the Lincoln Center apartment houses are integrated, but they usually fail to mention that they are integrated by upper middle class Negroes and not by Negroes and Puerto Ricans who had been driven from the area by the bulldozers. These houses, where 90 percent of the 4,271 apartments rent for \$61 a room, have at best token integration and the project, despite HRB denials, is a prime example of what civil rights leaders call "Negro removal."

"It's unfortunate that someone has to be hurt and suffer but you have got to think

of the greater need and the greater good," says one city official. "And, for a city the size of New York, the greater need is the elimination of slums."

Few people—even those uprooted by urban renewal—would dispute this. Everybody knows slums are bad and everybody knows slums must go. But what troubles these people and the many, many others is the lack of leadership from city hall, the indecision and the bureaucracy of the planning and urban renewal units, the corruption, the politics, the inhumanity, and the irrationality that have plagued this city's clearance program throughout the years of its existence.

DESPERATION OR DECISION?

It makes little sense to clear one slum merely to start another one somewhere else. New housing is desperately needed, but, unfortunately, those who are the most desperate have, for the most part, been the last to get it.

Anyone can tell you that Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant both need immediate and far-sweeping urban renewal programs and low and lower middle income housing, but, because of the magnitude of the problem and the uncertainty of where to house the people while the areas are being rebuilt, the city chooses to look and rebuild elsewhere.

"I'm absolutely committed to making New York a slumless city, a city in which every family, regardless of race, color, or creed, will live in a decent home, at a price it can afford to pay, in a good neighborhood with soundly planned community facilities," wrote Mayor Wagner in a series of syndicated articles last summer.

The mayor obviously meant every word he wrote, but, to those people forced to move out of Bellevue South, Lincoln Center, and dozens of other renewal areas and those people unable to move out of Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant and the city's other slums, the mayor's inaction speaks louder than his words. No matter what name you call it—be it human renewal or human removal—the city's housing problems are extreme and in desperate need of remedial action.

ANNOUNCEMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING REPRINTING OF STATEMENTS MADE ON THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINE'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that reprints will be made of statements of Members of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. The reprinting has been requested by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., 302 West 13th Street, New York, N.Y.

If there are any Members who do not wish to have their statements reprinted, they should so advise the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk, Mr. Raymond F. Noyes, room H-112, the Capitol Building.

Otherwise, statements and remarks made in connection with this year's Ukrainian Independence Day will be reprinted in pamphlet form.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON, IN HIS BUDGET MESSAGE, RECOGNIZES REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN'S MONUMENTAL WORK IN EXPOSING ABUSES OF TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant passages of the President's budget message to the Congress of January 25, is worthy of noting verbatim:

I will also present recommendations to correct certain abuses in the tax-exempt privileges enjoyed by private foundations.

In that brief statement, the President recognized one of the great achievements of his fellow Texan, the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee, which has been studying the impact of tax-exempt foundations on the Nation's economy. My good colleague is mainly responsible for the magnificent work done by the House Small Business Committee in bringing to light the costly abuses of numerous tax-exempt foundations.

One measure of the Small Business Committee's accomplishments is the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has recovered large amounts of taxes resulting from the material published by the committee. Of recent date, the Internal Revenue Service filed a tax lien for \$22 million in back taxes, interests, and penalties against one of the 546 foundations which have been under study by the subcommittee. In another case the Internal Revenue Service was able to get \$642,000 in taxes based on the business activities of a foundation which was under study by the subcommittee. And there is probably still more to come.

By his remarks in his budget message, the President shows that he understands what Mr. PATMAN has been talking about and clearly recognizes the problems tax-free foundations spawn. One of the great problems that has been ever presented in Mr. PATMAN's work is the recognition of foundation-controlled enterprises competing in the marketplace with taxpaying businessmen. As a working member of the Small Business Committee, I know firsthand that this has concerned us no end. It is clearly recognized, along with other pertinent subject matter, in a splendid editorial in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of January 24, called "Disguised Menace," which I enter for the RECORD.

A second editorial, which appeared December 6, 1964, in the Dallas, Tex., Times Herald, by A. C. Greene, editor of the editorial page, entitled "Representative PATMAN Digs at the Foundations," is also entered for the RECORD.

These two editorials get at the heart of the entire problem, which President Johnson sees so clearly and wishes to

correct. For the President to thus recognize the great work of WRIGHT PATMAN is but another achievement by another great Texan, the President's colleague and mine, WRIGHT PATMAN.

The articles follow:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, Jan. 24, 1965]

DISGUISED MENACE

In 1962 Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, produced his monumental study of tax-exempt foundations. In 1963 and 1964 further investigations were undertaken and reports published.

The realm of tax-free foundations, as revealed by PATMAN's studies, is one characterized by almost complete lack of official information, by mushrooming growth both in number and wealth of foundations, and by, in PATMAN's words, "laxness and irresponsibility" on the part of the Internal Revenue Service. This is not a good combination.

PATMAN also found violations of both law and Treasury regulations in many foundations. He noted a rapidly increasing concentration of economic power in foundations which, in his view, was "far more dangerous than anything that has happened in the past in the way of concentration of economic power."

"Foundation-controlled enterprises possess," he added, "the money and competitive advantages to eliminate the small businessman." Perhaps more important is the erosion of the tax base that supports the Federal Government. Every dollar which escapes taxation by flowing into a tax-free foundation, no matter how laudable the purpose of that foundation may be, puts an added burden on other taxpayers of the Nation.

PATMAN found numerous abuses. He found donors who, through loans or exchanges, obtained a return of the assets they had donated. He found them lending to themselves and their friends out of foundation funds. He found them using foundations to help their own positions in proxy fights. He found donors using a foundation to keep voting control of a corporation in the family after the death of the principal stockholder.

PATMAN made several recommendations for reforms. Among them were these:

1. That the life of foundations should be limited to 25 years instead of permitting them to exist in perpetuity.
2. Tax-exempt foundations should be prohibited from engaging in business, directly or indirectly.
3. Commercial money-lending and borrowing by foundations should be banned.
4. Foundations should not be permitted to own more than 3 percent of the stock of any corporation.
5. No contributor should be allowed a deduction for payments to a foundation that he controls until the foundation actually uses the money for charity.
6. There should be an agency to regulate tax-exempt foundations, requiring full disclosure of foundation assets and expenditures and a national registry of all foundations.

In the 2 years that have elapsed since PATMAN made his first report nothing has happened, except that a bad problem has gotten worse. The whole field needs closer supervision. Both Congress and the Treasury should take action on the Patman report and his recommendations.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald, Dec. 6, 1964]

REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN DIGS AT THE FOUNDATIONS

(By A. C. Greene)

One of the constant problems of a democratic system lies in keeping a balance be-

tween good laws and an unjust usage of them. Right now there is approaching a period of adjustment for the tax-exempt foundation. The idea of a charitable, educational, religious, or scientific foundation being given tax-exempt status on the basis of its aims and public good is acceptable. The problem comes when these virtuous uses are turned to private or nonbeneficial ends.

Leading the legislative battle for stricter foundation control is Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, and in 36 years of House service he has proven himself to be the bulldog of Congress.

The Congressional Quarterly says PATMAN made a detailed study of 546 privately controlled foundations from among the 45,124 the Internal Revenue Service says exists. (PATMAN estimates there actually are 100,000 foundations in the United States.)

THE UNREASONABLE ACCUMULATION

His general findings as reported by Congressional Quarterly, were:

1. The IRS has been lax and irresponsible in supervising foundations.
2. Foundations had unreasonable accumulations of income.
3. Foundations widely disregarded Treasury regulations, despite penalties provided by law.
4. There was increasing concentration of economic power in foundations which PATMAN felt "was far more dangerous than anything that has happened in the way of concentration of economic power."
5. Foundation-controlled enterprises had the money and competitive advantages to eliminate the small businessman.

Therefore PATMAN has urged an immediate moratorium on the granting of new tax exemptions to foundations and has recommended that the life of a foundation be limited to 25 years and that foundations be prohibited from engaging in business, directly or indirectly; commercial moneylending and borrowing; exercising control over any corporations; speculating or trading in securities; soliciting or accepting contributions from suppliers or users of foundation goods or services, and self-dealing practices between a contributor and the foundations he controls.

Actually, the use of a foundation to distribute money for public purposes or to support public programs is stimulating to responsible use of wealth and relieves a great many areas of governmental spending. But some foundations seem to accumulate money faster than they spend it, some foundations have elaborate lists of officers who draw more than justifiable salaries, are housed in quarters far above the keeping of their ostensible purposes. Not to mention the foundations which are benevolent in name only and are set up as an attempt to gain tax shelter for some private tax-grinding purpose.

"CHARITABLE" IS A "FORMALITY"

PATMAN says it's too easy to get tax exemption for a foundation today. The process has become, he says, "a mere formality. An organization becomes 'charitable' merely by describing itself as such."

The ideal foundation is one which receives contributions from private sources and these funds are then administered by a control which is separate and public. Most of the famous foundations have come to this—the original founders having no control over operations once the foundation has been set into specific motion.

Representative PATMAN's drive has recently drawn two foundations under close scrutiny which have particular Dallas interest: the Life Line Foundation, operated by H. L. Hunt, and Christian Echoes National Ministry, which is operated by Billy James Hargis, of Tulsa, founder and director of the Christian Crusade.

The Internal Revenue Service district directors in Baltimore in 1962 and 1963 rec-

commended revoking Life Line's tax-exempt status, and about 3 weeks ago the Tulsa directors recommended the same for the Hargis organization, both recommendations on the grounds that the foundations engaged in political propaganda instead of education.

PATMAN's particular concern is the problem of "unreasonable accumulation." He found that while approximately 50 percent of income in operating and administrative expenses, some 40 percent (of \$7 billion, in this case) was left unspent. He foresees a day, under this process, when foundations could control private wealth and investment.

The Treasury Department feels the next Congress will pass measures to alleviate problems in at least three areas: self-dealing between contributor and the foundation he controls, foundations in business and the "unreasonable accumulations."

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon says his Department does not intend interfering with operations of the great foundations which are reputable and doing such an excellent job. On the contrary the hope is to strengthen the legitimate foundations by eliminating those which are trying to ride on their backs by doing things which they shouldn't do. PATMAN is taking the personal role of seeing that it happens.

THE NATION HAS NOW ENJOYED 49 MONTHS OF UNBROKEN ECONOMIC ADVANCE

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has now enjoyed 49 months of unbroken economic advance. Predictions pertinent to our national future are all forecasts of continued growth. All sectors of American life are counting on a continuing and even substantial growth in our economy as a whole.

To support this necessary growth we assume that there will be enough natural resources to go around and fill the needs of our country and people. As of today, I feel this may well be a very ill-founded assumption. We have no sound reasons for believing that our country's soil, water, timber, grassland, wildlife, and other natural resource needs will be adequately met. As a nation and as a government, in the executive or the legislative branch, we are not pursuing a sufficient and deliberate course to meet them. I believe as our late great President Kennedy said: "Let us begin." We are making some beginnings: H.R. 1111, the pending water resources planning measure introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], is part of this beginning and I wish to congratulate him and his colleagues for their efforts in water resources planning and coordination. But Mr. Speaker, we must also move forward on other fronts to find mutually acceptable solutions to problems fully grown. Time is running out—action may not be postponed any longer. By the year 2000 we will need 900 billion gallons of water a day. No one knows now where we will get this water, how it

will be divided up, or what it will cost. Beyond the year 2000 none of our forecasters even dare look—yet surely our future extends beyond that date.

Equally hard problems are at hand in connection with our soils, timber, ranges, recreation space, water storage sites, wildlife, and other renewable and nonrenewable natural resources.

It may be argued, and unfortunately frequently is the case, that ultimate decisions on national resource problems are budgetary decisions. Witness the 1966 budget presented to us. On the one hand we go forward with pollution control, natural beauty, saline water developments, and other tremendously important phases of the total problem. Yet on the other hand water development projects are curtailed, agricultural research is centralized to a degree perhaps nonresponsive to the regional soil and water needs of people, the basic agricultural stabilization and conservation practice program is cut in half and while we seek more recreational resources from the land and water conservation fund we cut to the bone the operating and development budgets for our public lands, national parks and wildlife refuges—even hear of administrative proposals to dispose of some of these public resources because their operation is too costly.

Obviously there is little if any evidence that resource budgeting is related in any deliberate or scientific way to national needs. Instead, appropriation requests for natural resource programs are based clearly on only past budget history or departmental ceilings rather than on any overall national appraisal of resource requirements.

The several resource programs of the Federal Government are now distressingly uncoordinated in their operations. Each program is administered independently of others. The many interagency and interdepartmental committees which give lip service to cooperative and coordinated resource development are highly ineffective in resolving the basic conflicts and issues which face our Nation in the field of natural resources. The Nation can no longer afford the Medusa-like committee approach as a substitute to the unified national leadership so urgently required by the Nation.

The basic nature of the resource problems before us demand continuing, intelligent national planning and programming not handicapped by entrenched bureaucratic rivalries. A source of effective positive leadership is required for the overall continuation of national resource efforts to the Nation's oncoming needs. To provide this vital leadership and programming the bill, which I have the pleasure of introducing today—and which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Mr. McGOVERN, has introduced in the other body, establishes a White House Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers paralleling the Council of Economic Advisers. It establishes select committees in the Senate and the House each composed of members of the four committees dealing with resources legislation, Interior, Public Works, Agriculture, and Commerce, which will meet at least once annually, early in each session of Congress, to con-

sider an annual national resources report by the Council.

It would establish the same sort of centers of informed, continuing resources and conservation leadership in the executive branch and Congress that we have successfully and beneficially set up in the economic field.

Mr. Speaker, I urge we begin at last to deal with our resource problems in an intelligent and coordinated manner and in a manner in which both the executive and legislative branches may make their full contributions to a better, more prosperous America for tomorrow.

DISTINGUISHED MEMBER OF BUSINESS COMMUNITY ALINES HIMSELF WITH GENERAL, BROAD GOALS OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is no longer headline news when a distinguished member of the business community aligns himself with the general, broad goals of the Great Society President Johnson has set down for his administration.

During the campaign last November, a sizable delegation of businessmen and industrialists joined with leaders of organized labor, farmers, and members of the professions in rejecting the reactionary philosophies of arch conservatism. They did so with vision and with courage.

I was particularly delighted this past week to receive the full text of remarks made by Stewart S. Cort, president of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. before the Metropolitan Baltimore Chamber of Commerce on January 18.

Mr. Cort is among the most distinguished spokesmen in American industry today. He has brought to his duties with Bethlehem Steel Corp. not only a superb sense of business economics but, far more important, I think, an awareness of the public responsibility a growing and prospering business enterprise must have.

In his address to the Baltimore chamber, Mr. Cort has set down a remarkable and highly commendable set of guidelines for America's giant corporations. It is a blueprint with which most informed and enlightened businessmen can heartily agree. I think most other members of the community will find it encouraging, also.

We may disagree on some of the specifics set forth in Mr. Cort's "Pattern for Progress." But no one can possibly discount the good faith and the enormous sense of civic duty which went into making them.

I commend Mr. Cort's excellent address to those of my colleagues who look upon the future of our great Nation as a challenge, not to Government alone, but to all interests in our society and to all individuals.

I ask that the text be included as part of the RECORD at this point.

A PATTERN FOR PROGRESS

(An address by Stewart S. Cort, president, Bethlehem Steel Corp.)

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you, Mr. Wehr, not only for your gracious introduction, but for accurately naming my employer.

Up until just a few days ago I might have been described as working for Bethlehem Steel Co., which was for many years the principal operating subsidiary of Bethlehem Steel Corp., although I held identical titles in both the company and the corporation. At yearend, the company was merged into the corporation, and I have only 1 official employer, plus 250,000 stockholders. There were many reasons for the merger. Our lawyers agreed that they are good ones and, when you consider what you have to pay for legal eagles these days, you can't afford to ignore their advice—besides, they didn't recommend a cut in my pay.

Another good thing about this merger is that it could be accomplished without bringing down the wrath of the Department of Justice on our heads. There are very few mergers about which this can safely be said these days. In fact, there are very few business decisions of any kind which are not influenced to some degree by Government activities. Because of this basic fact of present-day life, our country's progress now requires more than ever before that business and Government understand the other's role and act on the basis of that understanding. This gets me—not entirely by accident—to the subject of my talk.

As businessmen, you and I know that the motivating force behind real economic progress is free enterprise. Commerce and industry, functioning in a congenial community atmosphere, have indeed contributed mightily toward making Greater Baltimore a truly greater Baltimore.

As a former resident, I am impressed—as any visitor to this city must be—by Charles Center. It is the crown jewel of your midcity rejuvenation—and what a gem it will be.

Likewise, there is evidence all around us of the success of your efforts to attract new industry to this area—in which Bethlehem people have gladly shared. This has brought many benefits to your community and its citizens.

Finally, there is the example of our own Sparrows Point plant, an industrial establishment that has sprung from humble roots. It was founded in 1887 by men who saw opportunity in serving the material needs of a growing nation. They were farsighted men—as were those who formed a small iron company in Bethlehem, Pa., in the mid-1800's. Both enterprises prospered, grew, and combined forces in 1916. As a part of Bethlehem Steel, Sparrows Point accomplished what it never could have done on its own—it has become the greatest steel plant in the free world.

In a year's time, Bethlehem provides a payroll of close to \$240 million in the Baltimore area, pays about \$14 million in local taxes, and purchases millions of dollars in goods and services from local firms. I recite these facts simply to emphasize the tremendous benefits resulting from what I look upon as a pattern for progress—private enterprise working within a healthy climate provided by realistic and forward-looking government—in this case, local government.

But just as weather patterns take form and gather strength at some distance from the places where they ultimately determine the climate, so the climate for business is to a large degree formed, not in the local community, but on the banks of the Potomac—on occasions an extremely high-pressure area.

Let's take a look at the Washington weather map today.

We see a Federal establishment of colossal proportions and armed with formidable powers. If big government is a necessity in our day and age—and I must regretfully admit that it seems to be—it is a costly one. Today, all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—account for more than 30 percent of all expenditures for goods and services compared with only 8 percent as little as 35 years ago. And today the Federal Government accounts for more than 50 percent of that total in contrast to 15 percent in 1929.

We all know where those dollars come from. The burden of taxation was once described in these vigorous words: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. If those taxes are excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and in hordes of hungry people tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay. They pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy, or in unemployment throughout the land." There is much truth in those words uttered in Pittsburgh in 1932, by a presidential candidate. His name was Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Whatever the historical reasons and whatever the cost, we are in an environment of tremendous Government activity. It may be what is demanded by the times we live in, and there is little likelihood of any substantial reduction in the role of Government in the foreseeable future.

Now, how does the Washington weather map look to me? What kind of a climate can we expect it to provide for our pattern for progress?

The recent tax cut and the more realistic treatment of depreciation by the Treasury are good signs. Government seems to have a clearer idea than it did at times in the past of the role of free enterprise in achieving a growing, stable, and prosperous economy.

We have seen, and I think most of us approve, the appointment of able and responsible businessmen to Federal offices, including Cabinet level. We are conscious of an increased willingness, if not even eagerness, on the part of various Federal agencies to sit down with business and industry and discuss mutual problems in the office instead of the courtroom.

A careful reading of the weather map shows some clouds, of course. There are plenty of people in Washington who seem to think that all important decisions must be made there. There are far too many who seem to believe that Government spending is more potent than private when it comes to stimulating the economy. And there is a marked tendency in some Government quarters to use the shotgun approach in dealing with complex problems. But the general tone is encouraging.

For our part, I believe businessmen should accept these promising indications at face value and do their best to enhance them.

I can assure you that my own company is going to do its best to work in harmony with Government for a healthy, prosperous economy. President Johnson has proposed for business a sixfold obligation: to market high-quality products and to develop new and improved products; to strive always to reduce costs; to sell vigorously in the domestic market and, when possible, abroad; to provide job security and incentives to our employees; to invest to the limit of our ability in sound expansion; and, to manage so as to encourage economic stability.

I believe you will agree with me that these objectives are quite consistent with our own ideas as to the primary functions of private enterprise.

But I think that sound and forward-looking business management requires even more than the President has proposed. Private

business must develop a keener awareness of the impact of its policies and actions on the public. We must be less inclined to stand on our private rights and more inclined to accept public responsibility. If we do not voluntarily accept broader responsibility, we can expect that what we fail to do will be undertaken by the Government, on terms we probably would not like—and we get the bill anyway. Affirmative thinking and affirmative action are needed.

Second, we must do a far more effective job of instilling a better understanding and a wider acceptance of the concept and benefits of private enterprise. The importance of business profits remains too little appreciated—and too little understood—by the general public. Profits are so basic to the remarkable growth of our economy that most people have gotten in the habit of taking them for granted and have forgotten how essential they are.

We businessmen are the logical spokesmen for the free enterprise system, and yet much of what we say is really a case of talking to ourselves. If we would be effective disciples of the free enterprise system, let us preach the gospel not to the faithful, but to the unbelievers, or to those whose faith is weak.

Preaching the gospel in this case does not mean making speeches about abstractions. People in government are like people everywhere else. They are convinced more by performance than by oratory, and they are most likely to be convinced when the performance relates to problems with which they are directly concerned. It is not enough to keep reminding people that our unparalleled standard of living is the product of the enterprise system. What we have to do at every opportunity is to demonstrate that business can make important contributions to the solution of today's great problems and many of the nagging smaller ones too—if Government and business coordinate their activities. It is not generally recognized that certain kinds of civilian problems which greatly concern the Government cannot be solved at all without the active participation of business. Let me give you an illustration:

One of our most stubborn national problems is the chronic deficit in our balance of international payments. The origins of the problem are extremely complex and its solution requires action on many fronts. In every instance, however, the action requires coordination between business and Government. Take the matter of increasing exports. We can export only those products which are competitive in world markets in terms of quality, delivered prices, and customer service. Maintenance of quality is primarily the job of the manufacturer, and depends increasingly on his being able to develop better technology and take advantage of it. That, in turn, is affected by Government tax policies and, to some extent, labor policies. Delivered prices of exported goods are influenced not only by production and transportation costs but also—and importantly—by internal tax policies and the tariff and tax policies of the country representing an overseas market. Customer service is affected by Government export credit and maritime policies.

The import side of international trade obviously plays a large part in our balance of payments. Now it should be plain to all that in the long run a nation cannot export without importing and, ideally, its total exports to all other countries of the world should equal its total imports. But to have that sort of ideal balance, all nations must be trading under the same rules. They are not today. As a result, some of our important industries, including steel, are being hurt by cutrate imports against which a private defense is impossible. Both the establishment of uniform international trading rules and the prevention of damage to do-

mestic industries are the responsibility of Government. The Government cannot, however, carry out that responsibility without the advice and experience of businessmen who have an intimate knowledge of the realities of trade.

I could go on into other actions which might help solve the balance-of-payments problem—the possibility of reducing foreign aid expenditures through increased private investment, the encouragement of overseas investments as long-term income producers, the attraction of foreign tourists to the United States and many others. But I think I have said enough to make clear that we must have real and close cooperation between business and Government if the problem is to be solved without adversely changing our economic institutions.

International trade is only one of a number of national problem areas in which only the joint efforts of business and Government can provide satisfactory answers. The alleviation of poverty is another. So is the social adjustment to technological change. We as businessmen must participate in the search for solutions unless we are willing to take the awful responsibility for having acquiesced in the destruction of what George Champion of the Chase Manhattan Bank recently called our "free opportunity system."

What, exactly, does this cooperation involve on our part?

First, we must identify the problems which we as businessmen are particularly qualified to work on. Some of these are obvious and some are not.

Second, we must understand what those problems consist of and what contribution we can make to their solution. This requires real study. Fortunately, we can get help from business associations, other private agencies and government bodies which are interested in particular problems. The point is not to sit back and wait until something has happened before we start finding out what the problems are.

Third, we must try to visualize the kinds of solutions which would be in the public interest and determine how they would affect our own longrun interest. This requires understanding the Government viewpoint which may be quite different from that of the business community.

Fourth, we must develop in concrete terms what we think are appropriate solutions, specifying the part business must play in them.

Finally, we must sell those solutions to the appropriate people in Government and to their constituents. Representatives in Government want to have our views and the facts upon which they are based.

This must seem like a very large order to men who wonder how they can handle their normal daily business responsibilities within 24 hours. Obviously, all of you cannot work on all the problems facing the United States, the State of Maryland, and the city of Baltimore. But each of us can be more actively interested in what associations like this one are doing. We can have more frequent and less casual contacts with our acquaintances in government at all levels. And we can all say, "Yes," more often when we are asked to help study one of the problems with which Government and business are wrestling. We might even go farther and volunteer to help.

The stake is worth the effort. It is simply the survival of the economic institutions to which we are all committed and on which the prosperity and safety of our society depend.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress. We must keep constant surveillance of our operations and practices so that they will be adequate to properly represent 190 million Americans, in this complex, changing world. We should not be satisfied with outdated operations, but should constantly seek ways to improve our procedures. Traditions should be revered and kept where they do the job, but old ways should be discarded when new methods get the job done quicker and better.

I believe a joint committee to study our operations and practices is a reasoned and moderate approach. I am pleased to join with Senator MONROE, a co-sponsor of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and with many other distinguished colleagues, in introducing legislation to create a joint committee. It would be composed of 12 Members—6 from the House and 6 from the Senate.

I have given a great deal of thought to suggested reforms which would be proper for the joint committee to consider, and I know that many Members are ready to testify on ways to improve the Congress. I strongly urge approval of legislation to create a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in my mind the veterans of this country deserve the service which the regional offices and veterans' hospitals provide them, and I am convinced that the VA's action in announcing the closings is inconsistent with that need. We pour billions of dollars out to foreign aid, but we cannot spend \$25 million on our veterans, who offered their life in time of national emergency.

I would appreciate if you would reprint attached letter, which is but one among hundreds that I have received on this subject, from Melvin L. Jacobsen, commissioner for veterans affairs in my State of Nevada. I believe you will find his remarks self-explanatory.

COMMISSIONER FOR VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Reno, Nev., January 27, 1965.

Hon. WALTER S. BARING,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALTER: The more I think of Mr. Driver's decision to move the Reno regional office to Los Angeles the more I'm concerned because of the lack of service to the veterans

in this area. As you know I am definitely against this move and I would like to tell you a few things that may not come to your attention concerning this move.

With the regional office in Reno, and it being the only regional office in the State of Nevada, this office is most important to the veteran who applies for his benefits from welfare, social security, Federal jobs and other benefits that he is interested in, especially pension and compensation. We work and coordinate claims with social security, also welfare, and this is very important because in so many cases when the veteran finds that he needs help he needs it immediately. With the regional office here, and with our co-operation with the Federal, State, and county agencies, it is only a matter of a couple of days and everyone concerned knows the particular case and in 15 to 30 days the veteran is receiving his benefit from Federal, State, or county agencies. With the regional office in Los Angeles the veteran will not get the service because we have to request the information necessary from Los Angeles and as you know in any large office it has to go thru the proper channels and this takes time. In other words the veteran that needs help immediately will have to wait months before he gets his service. I can go into more detail if needed and also specify cases where it was necessary to request information from other stations. There are times when we have to go outside regular channels to get the necessary information and even then it is sometimes weeks and months to get the information. The disabled veteran with the service-connected disability, in my opinion, is the one that will suffer the most from this move.

Again I implore you to do anything in your power to stop this move of the Reno regional office to Los Angeles.

Sincerely yours,

MELVIN L. JACOBSEN,
Commissioner.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM MCKINLEY

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, Members of the House took note of the birthday anniversary of one of our former Presidents, President William McKinley. It was only natural that a part of the program of the Ohio Society of Washington, D.C., for its January monthly meeting would also include some reference to this great Ohioan and dedicated public servant.

The task was admirably performed by Dr. Edward J. Wagner, administrative assistant to the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable JOHN GILLIGAN, of the First District. These brief comments, in my humble judgment, are quite in order for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend them to the reading of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF DR. EDWARD J. WAGNER

Tonight we observe the 122d anniversary of the birth of William McKinley—a great Ohioan, a great American and a great and dedicated public servant.

William McKinley's was a success story that could, even then, happen only in America. The son of an iron founder, William

McKinley advanced rapidly in life, from citizen-soldier in the Civil War to prosecuting attorney, to Member of Congress, to Governor of his State, and on to the Presidency itself. I think that it is significant that only three Presidents were elected to consecutive terms of office in the 64-year period between 1836 and 1900. One was Abraham Lincoln, one was U. S. Grant, another distinguished Ohioan, and the third was William McKinley.

History has not passed final judgment on his Presidency, but I think that it is significant that he had and held the confidence and goodwill of his fellow men during the historic period that has become known as the "McKinley era."

Though truly a man of compassion, William McKinley was shot down and fatally wounded in the fifth year of his Presidency. A contemporary account of the assassination, published in January 1902, read in part:

"The terrible shock of the assassination of President McKinley by Leon F. Czolgosz at Buffalo, N.Y., on September 6, 1901, imparted to the entire civilized world a mingled feeling of horror, vindictiveness, and revenge, which was exceeded only by the profound sense of sorrow and depression which took possession of the people."

All of us here just recently experienced the terrible shock of the loss of another great and good man. So we can well imagine how the people reacted to the murder of William McKinley.

But he, himself, had no thought of revenge or vindictiveness. McKinley died as he had lived—with firm reliance in the Almighty. Approaching death, his last words were, "It is God's way. His will, not ours, be done."

That his final thoughts were of God is not surprising. William McKinley firmly believed in the divinity of Christ and recognized Christianity as the mightiest factor in world civilization. The spirit of William McKinley, the goodness of this man, will live on as long as the dignity of man prevails. I might say in closing that William McKinley belongs to all Americans, regardless of political affiliation.

SHORTEN THE CAMPAIGN— A 1953 MESSAGE

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is mounting evidence of support for an abbreviated presidential election campaign. The legislation which I have filed for this purpose has been the subject of favorable editorials and other encouraging comment throughout the country.

My interest in this endeavor to spare our Nation and our candidates the rigors and the expense of long and boring campaigns has been well known to my colleagues since I first came to Congress. However, I have recently had called to my attention an address by Mr. William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., which he delivered before the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia on January 17, 1953.

This is further illustration that we have been far too long discussing this needed change by failing to take the essential action. I hope that we will

resolve ourselves to act during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks, I include here the following statement which is an excerpt from Mr. Paley's 1953 speech:

ADDRESS OF WILLIAM S. PALEY SHORTEN THE CAMPAIGN

It seems to me that one of the central and major contributions which television can make to our political life is to shorten the campaigning process by a considerable length of time. In this connection, I would like to present for the earnest consideration of the two major political parties the proposal that the national conventions should start around September 1. Allowing 3 weeks for the completion of the nominating process, this would leave approximately 6 to 7 weeks for the two candidates to present their cases to the people. The effective use of television and other media of communication, combined with the basic minimum traveling demands required by political necessity, would, in my judgment, enable the candidates to register a deep and pervasive impact on the electorate during this 7-week period.

The advantages that would accrue from this shortening the campaign seem to me to be inescapable. For one thing, it would substantially reduce the physical and mental strain upon the candidates by eliminating a large portion of the traveling and speaking which they must now subject themselves to. Even if it did nothing more than this, it would appear justified when you consider the initial strain on an individual who has suddenly been designated a nominee for the highest office in the land, with the grave responsibilities ahead which such office entails. It could even be said that it does serious injury to the national interest to impose the prolonged pressures of a protracted campaign upon an individual who is to be charged with the leadership of the Nation.

The public would share equally in the benefits accruing from a shorter campaign. Political campaigns divide families and friends. Initially keyed up by the excitement of the conventions, most citizens live in a heightened state of emotion during the campaign. Nerves lie close to the surface, and differing political sympathies flare up in frequent argument. Under present conditions, this atmosphere of controlled hostility is maintained for a period of 4 months. It is damaging to the spirit, not to mention the body politic.

DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN REPERCUSSIONS

But an even greater benefit of a shorter campaign period would be its salutary influence on the administrative process. As things now stand this process appears to come close to a complete halt during the hiatus between the end of the conventions and election day. It would seem as if Government suddenly suspended operation while awaiting the outcome of the election. Policies are postponed, actions delayed. The legislative and executive branches of Government virtually cease to function. The consequences of this stoppage extend far beyond our national boundaries. They affect world policy. During this period the governments of foreign nations live in a state of uneasiness and frustration. Because of the controlling position of the United States in world affairs they are uncertain as to what the future holds for their own fortunes. Many of them, unfamiliar with the traditional behavior of Americans during a presidential campaign, look upon our political emotionalism as a sign of disunity. Throughout the world our enemies rejoice and our friends grow nervous at our political quarreling, and although neither reaction has any basis in reality, the campaign period manages to create ferment and instability abroad.

Finally, a shortened campaign would inevitably result in lower campaign costs and expenditures by the national and State committees of the leading parties.

The argument that under the present arrangement the campaigns do not get underway in any event until after Labor Day does not seem to me to hold up under examination. It is invalid on several counts. During the recent campaign each of the two major candidates made six major speeches between August 5 and September 4.

But even if it were true that no major campaigning is undertaken prior to September 1, it is still questionable whether this would be a good thing, as far as the electorate is concerned. The speed of modern communications and the political sophistication of the American voter make the popular demand for immediate communication imperative. At the close of the two national conventions, the electorate is waiting expectantly for the candidates to communicate their views and positions. To delay the communication is only to produce anticlimax and uncertainty.

TIMING OF CONVENTIONS

There is no law that demands that the national conventions be held in June or July. In the colonial period, what passed for nominating conventions, but in reality were small private meetings of Government leaders, were held sporadically and irrelevantly at different times during the year preceding the election. There was no rhyme or reason behind their dates. The first actual presidential nominating convention composed of 112 delegates chosen from among the legislators of 13 States was held in Baltimore by the Anti-Masonic Party 14 months prior to the election of 1832. With the growth of political parties and the development of party organization, and the consequent need for mobilizing the various political forces throughout the country the habit developed of holding the national conventions in late spring following the adjournment of Congress. It was not until 1856 that the conventions began to be held with consistent regularity in June. The national committees met in December of the year preceding the election, at which time they fixed the date and place of their conventions. This practice has been followed ever since. It was thought necessary to allow for 3 or 4 months of campaigning after the convention in order to give the candidates an opportunity to make themselves known to the electorate.

But those were the days before airplanes and broadcasting. Today a campaign period of 4 months seems clearly obsolete.

OVERRIDING ADVANTAGES

In conclusion, therefore, I would again urge the serious consideration of the proposal that our national conventions be pushed forward to early September in view of the substantial advantages such a step would provide in shortening the campaign and thereby materially reducing the intensive pressures on both the presidential candidates and the general public as well as shortening the hiatus in government and curtailing the mounting costs of political campaigning.

The latest count at yearend reveals that there are approximately 21 million American homes equipped with television receivers and 117 television stations on the air. It will be difficult to name a sizable community in the country which will not be accessible to the sight and sound of the nominees of 1956.

The infinite ways in which television is modernizing our lives and extending our horizons—in education, in entertainment, in economics—become more manifest each day.

It seems to me inevitable that this modernizing effect should carry over into our political institutions. Moreover, this occasion and this city seem both a fitting time and place to introduce the possibilities of

such modernization. For it was in this city, after all, that the greatest documents of modern political life were introduced—documents which swept in an air of freedom such as man had never breathed before.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SAYLOR, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. PHILBIN, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. MICHEL, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OTTINGER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEED.
Mr. SWEENEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 8, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

503. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the utilization of ships provided to a nation under the military assistance program, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

504. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated June 19, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Ponce de Leon Inlet, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted July 16, 1958 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

505. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 13, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Kawaihae Harbor, Hawaii, requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, adopted March 17, 1960, and May 10, 1962, and a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 10, 1962. It is also in partial response to the River and Harbor Act approved May 17, 1950 (H. Doc. No. 75); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

506. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 7, 1964, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim survey of Oceanside Harbor, Oceanside (Camp Pendleton), Calif.,

authorized by Public Law 14, 79th Congress, approved March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

507. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of the Third Annual (1964) Report of the Office of Civil Defense, pursuant to section 5 of the Executive Order 10952 of July 20, 1961, and section 406 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

508. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "a bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

509. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend and clarify the laws relating to advertising in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

510. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 11-1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

511. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the appropriation of payments to support fire protection and fire prevention services for District of Columbia institutions located outside the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

512. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to increase the loan authorization for the construction of District of Columbia highways and to increase the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel tax"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

513. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'an act to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in certain employments in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved May 17, 1928, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

514. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved April 23, 1892, as amended, to authorize the deposit of public space excavation permit fees to the credit of such District of Columbia fund or trust fund account as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia determine"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

515. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 203(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, with respect to the filing of schedules of charges by connecting carriers"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of drafts of legislation covering several bills as an outcome of legislative recommendations in the Commission's 78th annual report; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

517. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Tucker Act, section 1346

(a) (2) of title 28, United States Code, to increase from \$10,000 to \$50,000, the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in the computation of years of Federal judicial service for judges of the U.S. District Court for the District of Alaska"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

520. Communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to further amend section 5 of the Reorganization Act of 1949" (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 66. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 647. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 947. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1064. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1065. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to provide an exemption from the tax imposed by such act for certain operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1066. A bill to amend section 11-1701 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the retirement salaries of certain retired judges; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate

the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia," approved May 23, 1918, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1700. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharge from, the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 948. A bill to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 24). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1007. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 25). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3314. A bill to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 4345. A bill to amend the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 to extend the period during which section 1306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as enacted by such act), was effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4346. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4347. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4348. A bill to debar evidence obtained through electronic eavesdropping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4349. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 4350. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and to amend such act to strengthen and protect fundamental legal and civil rights of individual workers required to join a union as a condition of employment; to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, or creed where employment is conditioned upon union membership or payment of moneys to a union; to prevent the use for political purposes of union dues and moneys paid by workers subject to compulsory union membership agreements; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4351. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance

for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4352. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4353. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4354. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4355. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 4356. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 4357. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 4358. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4359. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 4360. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4361. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4362. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4363. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4364. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4365. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 4366. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4367. A bill to amend section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to measurement of farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4369. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the withholding of tax on nonresident aliens with respect to income derived from investments in mutual savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4370. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, by equalizing taxation with a special exemption for

farm marketing and purchasing agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4371. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4372. A bill to specify the number of hospital beds that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs must maintain and operate at the veterans' hospital, East Orange, N.J.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4373. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 4374. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 231 of the National Housing Act to improve and render more effective the Federal direct loan and mortgage insurance programs providing assistance to housing for the elderly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 4375. A bill to provide for the sale by the Secretary of the Army of certain lands in the Fort Gibson Reservoir, in Oklahoma, subject to flowage easements and other reservations; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4376. A bill to create four judicial districts for the State of California, to provide for the appointment of four additional district judges for the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit premium compensation of firefighting employees to be considered as basic salary for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 4378. A bill to establish a third U.S. mint to be located in Will or Du Page County, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4379. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide free insurance protection for members of the Armed Forces serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4380. A bill to amend section 336 of title 38, United States Code, to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by overseas service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4381. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a Federal crime to transport stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 4382. A bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 4383. A bill to make permanent the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4385. A bill to amend section 304(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide that certain expenses shall not be allowable costs under certain contracts and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code to toll the running of the statute of limitations against tort claims of persons under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time their claims accrue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4388. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 4389. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4390. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion and Diversification Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 10-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4394. A bill to amend section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the truck use tax where the taxpayer, during the taxable period, disposes of a truck and acquires another truck; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4395. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4396. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 63 and to women at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 4397. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H.R. 4398. A bill to bring certain holders of star route and other contracts for the carrying of mail within the purview of the

Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 7-percent benefit increase, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to liberalize the retirement test, and to provide minimum benefits for all individuals not otherwise entitled at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4400. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for the greater protection of the President and the Vice President of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4401. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4402. A bill to authorize construction of flood control projects on the Housatonic, Still, and Naugatuck Rivers at Danbury and Derby, Conn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 4403. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under social security, to amend the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system to increase benefits, improve the actuarial status of the disability insurance trust fund, and extend coverage, to amend the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal financial participation in the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4404. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Kiwanis International; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4405. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4406. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4407. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4408. A bill to assist in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4409. A bill to assist in the construction and operation of senior citizens centers and programs of education, recruiting, and training for community service, counseling, and other activities in keeping with the needs of older citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4410. A bill to establish a Community Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4411. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit employer contributions for joint industry promotion of products in certain instances or a joint committee or joint board empowered to interpret provisions of collective bargaining agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4412. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 4413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4414. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4415. A bill to extend the operation of the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4416. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4417. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fossil Butte National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4418. A bill to amend section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to the disposition of the proceeds of sales, bonuses, royalties, and rentals under such act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4419. A bill to establish the Flaming Gorge National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4420. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4421. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 4422. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to contempt citations in the case of witnesses before congressional committees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4423. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in years 1966 and 1975 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4424. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation on the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits, and to provide that a woman who is otherwise qualified may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits without regard to her age if she is permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4425. A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4426. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4427. A bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 4428. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 to grant to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals jurisdiction to review decisions of the District of Columbia Tax Court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4429. A bill to provide for reimbursement to the State of Wyoming for improvements made on certain lands in Sweetwater County, Wyo., if and when such lands revert to the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4430. A bill to declare a national policy on conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that the United States shall pay the hospital expenses of certain veterans hospitalized under certain circumstances in non-Veterans' Administration hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 278. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve to the people of each State power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof in accordance with law and the provisions of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State with the approval of its electorate to consider factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution to authorize a contribution to certain inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, after August 15, 1945, and before April 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to authorize the President to declare a day of prayer and dedication in memory of American mission-

aries slain in the Congo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution to enable the District of Columbia government to aid the arts in ways similar to those in which the arts are aided financially by other cities of the United States by providing funds for special concerts for children and others, by aiding in the establishment of a permanent children's theater, and by providing for competitions to discover and encourage young Americans in the pursuit of excellence, and to acquaint them with the best of our national cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to conduct an impartial investigation of the recent events in Selma, Ala.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution to establish a joint committee to conduct an impartial investigation of the recent events in Selma, Ala.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 170. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to the liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from illegal Soviet occupation; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. Con. Res. 172. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should not be denied an opportunity to view the film prepared by the U.S. Information Agency entitled "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H. Con. Res. 173. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 6 of each year as German-American Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Con. Res. 174. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Con. Res. 175. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 176. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 181. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H. Con. Res. 183. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. Con. Res. 185. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H. Con. Res. 186. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARNUM:

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 192. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMANS:

H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYAL:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia be-

cause of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUOT:

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. Res. 189. Resolution providing for a review of the needs for local airline service by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H. Res. 190. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discontinuance of air service; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 191. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to amending title IV of the Social Security Act to permit mothers and older children in families in the aid to dependent children program to become employed to supplement their income without the reduction of ADC benefits because of earnings from such employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana: Memorial of the State of Montana relative to the closing of the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4432. A bill for the relief of Despina Kouloumoundras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4433. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fe O. Isla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Natalia Lores Cachero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Lee Shee Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Stavros Constantin Thomaidis and his wife, Helena Stavros Thomaidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Bryan George Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anisse Nichan Vizoyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Guisepina Bilotta Ruberto and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Angeliki Kandilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Halina J. Adamska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Remegio Fedelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Robert J. Beas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4444. A bill for the relief of Enzo Bertolotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Epifania F. Gamoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4446. A bill for the relief of Claudette Marie Dahl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4447. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4448. A bill for the relief of Lampros Nicolaidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4449. A bill for the relief of Mihran Mihranyan and his wife, Hayguhi Mihranyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4450. A bill for the relief of Miss Marion James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4451. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Livitsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Anastasiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 4453. A bill for the relief of Matteo Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 4454. A bill for the relief of Herman Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Miltiades Troumpoucis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 4456. A bill for the relief of Nellie C. Marzan Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 4457. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Miller and Mildred M. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4458. A bill for the relief of Michael Fahim Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4459. A bill for the relief of Giorgia Raniolo Infantino and her children, Georgio Infantino, Angelo Infantino, and Giovanni Infantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 4460. A bill for the relief of Georgia Manoles (formerly known as Georgia Demetrakopoulou); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4461. A bill for the relief of Dr. Violeta Poblacion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4462. A bill for the relief of Giacomo D'Andrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4463. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kostera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 4464. A bill for the relief of Michael Hadjichristofas, Aphrodite Hadjichristofas, and Panlote Hadjichristofas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

87. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting the proper authorities to give full consideration to the Mexican Isthmus of Tehuantepec as the site for a new inter-oceanic canal between the Atlantic and the Pacific; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Legislation Needed for Interstate Highway Extension Into Southwest Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to extend the Interstate Highway System into southwest Florida. The route would be along the same lines as U.S. 41, passing through Tampa and on to Bradenton, Punta Gorda, Fort Myers, Naples, Miami, and Homestead. This new superhighway would not only link cities in the rapidly growing gulf coast of Florida, but would serve the vital interests of Homestead Air Force Base and the various U.S. Naval and Coast Guard operations in the Florida Keys.

Recall the 1962 Cuban missile crisis, when large numbers of military equipment and personnel were moved into south Florida on short notice. This situation pointed up the need for providing military authorities with a high-speed access into an area of critical importance to the Nation's defense.

Yet military needs are not the only basis for extending the Interstate Highway System into southwest Florida. A good example for such an extension may be seen in Lee and Collier Counties as they are typical of the phenomenal population expansion which has taken place in our State. Lee County's population increased 25 percent in the past 4 years, and Collier County increased over 43 percent in the same period. As all indications forecast continued expansion in the future wise planning dictates that adequate roads such as an interstate extension be constructed now.

Finally, the 14 million tourists who visit Florida each year are citizens of virtually every State in the Union, and many of them use interstate superhighways outside Florida to reach their destinations. As more than 82 percent of Florida's tourists travel by automobile, the extension of an interstate route into the lower gulf coast would not only serve the economy of the surrounding area but

the demands of millions of Americans who tour our State as well.

For these reasons I urge prompt action on legislation designating a new interstate highway route into southwest Florida. Since first introducing such legislation in 1959, I have worked to see an interstate highway become a reality in this area. Our State has changed greatly since then, and the need for a new superhighway has become even more pressing. Proper planning and foresight demand this highway improvement now.

Eulogy to Michael A. McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the passing to his heavenly reward on January 31, of Michael A. McGrath, one of Ohio's most beloved and outstanding citizens.

Michael McGrath's passing will be lamented throughout the entire Irish-American community.

Michael McGrath, who, in his lifetime, was an outstanding lawyer and specialist in the insurance field, was also the past national president of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America.

Michael McGrath was an Irish-American of great warmth and intelligence, and one who was extremely proud of his Gaelic heritage. His life was dedicated to the principles of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; namely, friendship, unity, and Christian charity; and Michael McGrath lived these traditions on a day-to-day basis every day of his life.

In addition to his service with the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Michael McGrath also served as member and officer of the Clan Nae Gael, the Irish good-fellowship society and the United Irish Society of Cleveland.

He was a former administrative assistant for the late U.S. Representative Charles A. Mooney, of Ohio's 20th Congressional District, and most active

through the years in the affairs of the Democratic Party of Cuyahoga County.

Mr. Speaker, with the passing of men such as Michael McGrath, so, too, passes an era in which the Irish of this land had to fight for recognition without the benefit of laws that exist today against discrimination. Michael McGrath was in the forefront of that struggle for national recognition of his rights. He was a credit to his nation, to his church, and to his family and always steadfast in his defense of America's historical heritage of liberty and freedom.

On the occasion of his passing, our hearts go out in sympathy to his daughter, Janice Hurd, his two grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren, as well as his sister, Mrs. Katherine Paes, of Concord, Calif.

Postmaster General Gronouski Addresses Oklahoma Press Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 4, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General John A. Gronouski visited Oklahoma last week for an address before the annual midwinter convention of the State press association at Oklahoma City.

His remarks on the operation of the Post Office Department and its future are significant and constructive, and I herewith enter the text of his speech:

I am happy to be here with you today. I take great pleasure in the opportunity to speak to this distinguished group of newspaper editors and publishers. And I am honored that your invitation should have come through two men I have long admired: Senator MIKE MONRONEY and Congressman CARL ALBERT.

My respect for Senator MONRONEY and Congressman ALBERT is so great that I could easily devote the entire time I have allotted to me this morning in a tribute to them.

As you know, MIKE MONRONEY is chairman of our Postal Operations Subcommittee, and he's one of the acknowledged experts in the United States on the postal service. As such, he's a pretty tough taskmaster on all of us